MISCELLANEOUS MISCONCEPTIONS IN THE GAUḌĪYA MAṬHA AND ITS BRANCHES

30 major issues, 27 minor issues, 10 mis-illustrations,
31 mis-translations and 9 oddities

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MAJOR ISSUES

***PARAMPARĀ/SAMPRADĀYA*-ISSUE**

Why Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī's initiation from Gaurakiśora dāsa Bābājī is doubtful. 5

b. Gaurakiśora Dāsa Bābājī's Guru parampara

c. The true *dīkṣā*-connections

d. Dead *mantras* and body *paramparā*

e. Bhāgavat *paramparā*

f. Tilaka *svarūpa*

The Gauḍīya Sampradāya is not a branch of the Madhva Sampradāya.....8

Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas in saffron cloth.....9

Deviating from *śāstra*.....11

***APARĀDHA*-ISSUE**

Vaiṣṇava *nindā*.....12

Devotional boasting and challenging is an offence to the holy name.....13

***RĀGĀNUGĀ*-ISSUE**

Who is in *śānta rasa* in Vraja?.....14

Why always *gopī bhāva*?.....16

Qualification for *rāgānugā bhakti*.....18

The stop-over theory.....25

Discrepancies between A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami's 'Nectar of Devotion' and the teachings of the initial *ācāryas*.....27

Rāgānugā starts at the stage of *niṣṭhā*?.....32

What is *rāgātmikā* and what is *rāgānugā*?.....35
The *siddha deha*.....36
Doing *bhajana* is not selfish, or acting only for one's own liberation.....39
Rāgānugā bhakti does not hamper a preaching mission.....44

VARṆĀŚRAMA-ISSUE

Who is a *brāhmaṇa*?.....44
Second initiation or *mantra*-initiation is not *brāhmaṇa*-initiation.....52
Who is a *gosvāmī*?.....58
Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu not against the caste system.....64
Mixed marriages.....70
Can *sannyāsa* be abandoned?.....71

JĪVA-ISSUE

The origin of the *jīva* is not the spiritual, but the material world.....74
The living entity, after falling down from the spiritual world, first becomes Brahmā, and then takes lower and lower births.....82
The *siddha deha* or *kṛṣṇa-prema* are external gifts of the Lord, they are not dormant within the heart of the conditioned soul.....83
sahajiya vāda.....90
Free will.....91
Falling down from *brahman*.....95
svarūpa is not a form.....96
The *jīva* is not a part of *brahman* but of *paramātmā*.....97
Are sins committed in ignorance punished?.....97

MINOR ISSUES

Gṛhastha-kaupīns.....99
Atonement for breaking Ekādaśī.....99
The order of the *paramparā* on the altar.....100
Cooking and serving *prasāda*.....100
First offering to Guru, then to Kṛṣṇa?.....102
Worshipping Balarāma.....103

Is Nityānanda Prabhu the original Guru?....104
The four regulative principles....104
Beating women....105
Women less intelligent?....105
The Guru mingling in the disciples' private lives....106
It is not allowed to give *dīkṣā* while one's guru is still alive?....107
Lord Jagannātha in Vaikuṇṭha?....108
Who wrote the *ārādhyo bhagavān*-verse?....108
Rādhā-Londonīśvara, Rādhā-Pariśīśvara, Rādhā-Pārtha Sārathī....109
Some associates of Caitanya Mahāprabhu are not *nitya-siddha?*....110
Caitanya Mahāprabhu the Guru of Tukarām?....110
Selling deities commercially as dolls....111
Arjuna defeated Śiva?....112
Karṇa born from Kunti's ear?....112
Holy name multiplied 1,000x in the holy *dhāma*....112
Transcendental competition....113
The Rājasūya sacrifice after the war....114
Groups of consonants....114
Arjuna and Kunti in Kṛṣṇaloka....115
Refusing *prasādī tāmbūla*....115
Changing into, not out of Vaiṣṇava-dress....116

MIS-ILLUSTRATIONS

Four Kumāras, Mahāprabhu and His associates, mother Yaśodā, Varuṇaloka, Varāha, Nārada, Kṛṣṇa's *tilaka*, Sītā-devī, Śacī-devī, Advaita....117-119

MIS-TRANSLATIONS

Upadeśāmṛta verse 1....120
Goloka in Kṛṣṇa-book chapter 27....120
Paurṇamāsī Rādhā's mother?....120
Greeks and Turks in the Bhāgavata?....120
Halava in ancient Vraja?....120
Subdued by His sweethearts or vice versa?....121
Incarnation....122
Demon....122

karmī.....122
jñāna.....122
Conjugal love.....122
Guñjā-*mālā*.....122
“Since time immemorial”.....124
Bhakti.....124
Bhagavad Gītā As It Is 8.6.....124
Bhagavad Gītā As It Is 9.26.....124
Varṇa saṅkara.....124
Electricity in the spiritual sky.....125
Demigods.....126
Projecting ISKCON-mission on Mahāprabhu’s flood of *prema*.....126
Bhagavad Gītā As It Is 5.14.....126
Tumburu in Śrīmad-Bhāgavata 1.13.38, 59.....127
vṛṣalī in Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 6.2.26, 33.....127
Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 10.84.13.....128
hare kṛṣṇa mantra.....129
Caitanya-caritāmṛta Antya līlā chapter 6.....130-1

ISKCON ODDITIES

Eating of carrots.....131
Kīrtan of name of Guru.....132
Calling all men ‘*prabhu*’.....132
Calling all female devotees ‘*mātājī*’.....132
Chanting loud *japa*.....132
Allowing guests to do *abhiṣekha* during festivals.....132
Chanting beads are 108 *gopīs*.....132
Gopīnātha stands for *prayojana,* Govinda for *abhidheya* and Madanmohan for *sambandha*.....132
Golden age of 10,000 years.....132
Imperfectly composed literature.....133
The *senāpati*.....133
Quantity counts?.....134
Ungrateful to Prabhupāda?.....135
Conclusion.....135

***PARAMPARĀ/SAMPRADĀYA*-ISSUE**

1) THE *DĪKṢĀ*-ISSUE - Though it can not be decisively proven that Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī **never took *dīkṣā* from Śrī Gaurakiśora dās Bābājī,** there is a large amount of circumstantial evidence:

a**.** If Bhaktisiddhānta is Gaura Kiśora Dās Bābājī's disciple, then why didn't he give us Gaurakiśora's **Guru-*paramparā,*** instead of saying that Gaurkiśora dās Bābājī was the disciple of Bhaktivinoda? Not mentioning one's Guru's Guru is *guror avajña*, disregard of Guru, the third offence to the holy name.

b. Regarding Bhaktisiddhānta's version of **the rest of the *guru-paramparā, dīkṣā-wise:***

"And from Srila Rupa Goswami, Srila Raghunath Das Goswami comes as the direct disciple and the author of Sri Chaitanya Charitamrita i. e., Sri Krishna Das Kaviraj Goswami stands to be his direct follower. From Goswami Krishna Das Kaviraj the direct disciple is Srila Narottam Das Thakur who accepted Viswanath Chakrabarty as his servitor. Viswanath Chakrabarty accepted Jagannath Das Babajee from whom Srila Bhaktivinode Thakore was initiated and Srila Gour Kishore Das Babajee the spiritual master of Om Vishnupada Bhaktisiddhanta Saraswati Prabhupad-the Divine spiritual Master of our humble self." - Back to Godhead March 20, 1960 - A.C.Bhaktivedanta Swami.

Refutation:

Sanātana Gosvāmī was actually the disciple of Vidyā Vācaspati – *vidyā vācaspatim gurum* (Bhakti Ratnākara 1.598-602, quoting Daśama-ṭippaṇī)

Rūpa Gosvāmī was a disciple of Sanātana Gosvāmī – *sanātana tanor mad īśasya*. (Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu 1.1.3)

Jīva Gosvāmī was a disciple of Rūpa Gosvāmī.

Raghunātha dās Gosvāmī was a disciple of Yadunandanācārya (Vilāpa Kusumāñjali – 4).

Narottama dās ṭhākura was a disciple of Lokanātha Gosvāmī (*lokanātha lokera jīvana*), not of **Kṛṣṇadās Kavirāja.**

Viśvanātha Cakravartī was a disciple of Rādhā Ramaṇa Cakravartī and **never met his would-be Guru Narottama, for they lived a century apart.**

Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa was a disciple of Rādhā Dāmodara Gosvāmī,
not of **Viśvanātha Cakravartī.**

Jagannātha dās Bābāji lived 150 years after his would-be Guru Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa.
Bhaktivinoda was a disciple of Vipin Bihāri Gosvāmī, not of **Jagannāth dās Bābājī.**

c. B.R. Śrīdhar Mahārāja, Gauḍīya Maṭh, "Sri Guru and his grace", 1983 p.50 -

Dead Mantras

So, the very gist of the guru parampara, the disciplic succession, is siksa, the spiritual teaching, and wherever it is to be traced, there is guru. One who has the transcendental eye, the divine eye, will recognize the guru wherever he appears. One who possesses knowledge of absolute divine love in purity - he is guru. Otherwise the guru parampara is only a body parampara: a succession of bodies. Then the caste brahmanas, the caste goswamis, will continue with their trade, because body after body, they are getting the mantra. But their mantra is dead. We are after a living mantra, and wherever we can trace the living tendency for a higher type of devotional service, we shall find that there is our guru.

Where is in *śāstra*:

1. Dead *mantra*?

2. Body *Dīkṣā*?

Jagannāth dās Bābājī, Madhusūdan dās Bābājī of Sūryakuṇḍa, Manohar dās Bābājī of Govinda-kuṇḍa, Jay Kṛṣṇa dās Bābājī of Kāmyavan and Vamśī dās Bābājī of Navadvīpa all took *dīkṣā* from *kula-gurus* without giving them up for *'mahā-bhāgavatas*' and became *siddha*. How is their *mantra* 'dead' then?

Elsewhere Śrīhar Mahārāja says the holy name gives life to the mantra, yet he contradicts himself by saying Caste-goswāmīs' mantras are dead. The holy name is not in there or so?

Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu said – *nāmnāmakāri bahudhā nija sarva śaktis* – „The holy name is endowed with all transcendental energies."

d. A **Bhāgavata Paramparā**, a collection of all the great Vaiṣṇava Ācāryas, instead of a *dīkṣā paramparā* is nowhere mentioned in *śāstra*. One should submissively and humbly accept the mercy of the descending *paramparā* instead of granting the great previous *ācāryas* a seat in one's own hand-picked *paramparā*.

e. What is the *tilaka svarūpa* of Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī and his followers? For instance, the Nityānanda parivāra-initiates have a Nim-leaf on the nose, the Advaita Parivāra-initiates have a Banyan-leaf on the nose, the Śyāmānanda Parivāra-initiates have an anklebell-form on the nose and so every bona fide Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava paramparā has its own *tilaka svarūpa,* which is revealed by the Guru and personally placed on the 12 parts of the disciple's body by him at the time of initiation. In Haribhakti Vilāsa (2.129) it is quoted: *sāmpradāyika mūdrādi bhūṣitaṁ taṁ kṛtāñjaliṁ* — "At the time of initiation the disciple receives the sectarean signs from the Guru". In the commentary to this verse Śrīla Sanātana Gosvāmī writes: *sāmpradāyikaṁ guru paramparā-siddhaṁ.* mudrā tilaka-mālādi svarṇāṅgulīyakādi ca tena bhūṣitam — "This *sāmpradāyika* refers to the *guru paramparā. Mudras* or signs means he is adorned with signs like *tilaka* and neckbeads." If Bhaktisiddhānta was a disciple of Gaurakiśora dās Bābājī, then why do they put *tilaka* without any fixed and distinct *svarūpa* on?

f. "*Those disciples who are fully following Gurudeva's mood and teachings are in the bhagavata-parampara. Srila Bhaktivinoda Thakura was not formally initiated by Srila Jagannatha dasa Babaji Maharaja, Sri Baladeva Vidyabhusana was not initiated by Srila Visvanatha Cakravarti Thakura and Srila Visvanatha Cakravarti Thakura was not initiated by Sri Narottama dasa Thakura. Sri Svarupa Damodara Gosvami was initiated by a mayavadi. Srila Haridasa Thakura was not initiated by anyone - so how did Srila Haridasa Thakura come into our line?*" - B.V. Nārāyan Mahārāja, Varsana - November 11, 1996

This is a tacit admission that Bhaktisiddhānta never received *dīkṣā* ("You see, I never got *dīkṣā* but that doesn't matter because Haridās Thākur also never got it"). This is wrong of course, because Haridās Thākur received *dīkṣā* from Advaita Prabhu, according to Advaita Prakāśa and Prema Vilāsa - books that are then promptly rejected by the Gauḍīya Math.

Claims that Śukadeva Gosvāmī and Rāmānanda Rāya were not initiated remain unproven – the fact that their *dīkṣā gurus* were not mentioned does not mean that they were not initiated. The *dīkṣā guru* of Kṛṣṇadās Kavirāj is not mentioned either but that does not mean that he was not initiated. Speaking of Rāmānanda Rāya, if the *paramparā* is supposed to be *bhāgavata-* or *śikṣā-paramparā*, then why isn't Rāmānanda Rāya placed above Mahāprabhu, as he was his Śikṣā-guru in Caitanya Caritāmṛta?

The importance of *dīkṣā* is stressed by all the Gosvāmīs – Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Goswāmī and Sanātana Gosvāmī in Haribhakti Vilāsa (chapters 1 and 2), Rūpa

Gosvāmī in Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu (1.2.74) and Jīva Gosvāmī in Bhakti Sandarbha. It is not something that should be neglected or played down.

2) THE GAUḌĪYA SAMPRADĀYA IS NOT A BRANCH OF THE MADHVA SAMPRADĀYA-

There is a gulf of difference between the Madhvaites and Gauḍīyas in *sādhana* and *siddhānta*. In Galta Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa may have presented the Gauḍīya Sāmpradaya as a part of the Madhva Sampradaya, to gain legitimacy for regaining the service of Govinda Mandir, but that was only for preaching purposes. The *dvaita* philosophy of the Madhvaites is very different from the *acintya bhedābheda* philosophy of the Gauḍīyas, and the Gauḍīyas have a totally different *sādhana* (pure *rāgānugā*) and goal (*mañjarī bhāva* in the service of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa in Vṛndāvana). Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa has recognized certain differences of opinion with the teachings of the Madhva sampradāya in his commentary on Tattva sandarbha (28):

bhaktānāṁ viprānām eva mokṣaḥ devāḥ bhakteṣu mukhyāḥ viriñcasyaiva sāyūjyaṁ lakṣmyā jīva-koṭitvam ity evam mata viśeṣāḥ

"Only a *brāhmaṇa*-devotee is eligible for liberation, the *devatās* are foremost among devotees, Brahmā attains *sāyūjya-mukti* (merging in Brahman), and Lakṣmī-devī is included among the *jīvas* – these are differences in opinion."
Other differences include:

1. The Madhvaites practice *upāsana* on *vidhi-mārga*, filled with moods of *aiśvarya* (majesty) while the Gauḍīyas' worship is one of *rāga-mārga*, where *mādhurya* (sweetness) predominates.
2. The Madhvaites worship Nartaka-Gopāla alone, whereas the firm resolve of the Gauḍīyas who follow the footsteps of Śrī Raghunātha Dāsa Gosvāmī is substantially different: *ya ekaṁ govindaṁ bhajati kapaṭī dāmbhikatayā* "Whoever worships Govinda alone is a cheater and a hypocrite". Many proponents of the Madhva-*sampradāya* contest the existence of Śrī Rādhā altogether, since She is not presented in the literature of their *sampradāya* as a consort of Gopāla!
3. Madhva taught the concept of *dvaita*, or absolute duality, whereas Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu presented the refined concept of *acintya-bhedābheda-tattva*, the doctrine of simultaneous oneness and difference.

4. Moreover, we find the following words spoken by Śrīman Mahāprabhu Himself to an *ācārya* of the Madhva-*sampradāya* in the Caitanya Caritāmṛta (Madhya-līlā, 9.273-277):

śuni' tattvācārya hoilo antare lajjita; prabhura vaiṣṇavatā dekhi, hoilo vismita
ācārya kahe – tumi yei kaha, sei satya haya; sarva-śāstre vaiṣṇavera ei suniścaya
tathāpi madhvācārya ye kariyāche nirbandha; sei ācāriye sabe sampradāya-sambandha
prabhu kahe karmī, jñānī, dui bhakti-hīna; tomāra sampradāye dekhi sei dui cihna
sabe, eka guṇa dekhi tomāra sampradāye; satya-vigraha kari' īśvare karaha niścaye

"Hearing these words of Śrīman Mahāprabhu, the *ācārya* of the Tattva-vāda *sampradāya* became ashamed, and was struck with wonder upon seeing His degree of Vaiṣṇavism. The *ācārya* said, "Whatever you have told, that is the truth proclaimed in all scriptures, and the firm conviction of the Vaiṣṇavas. However, whatever Madhvācārya has firmly established, that we practice due to our *sampradāya*-connection with him." Prabhu said, "*Karmīs* and *jñānīs* are both devoid of *bhakti*. In your *sampradāya*, I can see symptoms of both. All in all, the only qualification I see in your *sampradāya* is your firm acceptance of the truth of the Lord's form."

Hence it should not be a surprise that a majority of the Gauḍīyas have little or no identification as members of the Madhva *sampradāya*. The fact that Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu speaks of the Madhva Sampradāya as *tomāra sampradāya*, or 'your tradition', in verse 277, is the strongest confirmation that the Gauḍīya Sampradāya is not Madhva- or Madhva-alllied.

3) How can you wear **<u>SAFFRON CLOTH</u>** while your would-be *sannyāsa guru* wore white? A *paramparā* that starts with white cloth and then suddenly switches to saffron cloth and '*brāhmaṇa*-initiation' is also not an uninterrupted *śikṣā-paramparā*. And saffron *dhotīs* do not exist at all, only saffron *bahirvāsas* for *eka-daṇḍī (māyāvādī) sannyāsīs* and white *dhotīs* for householders. This is also not a question of 'the form ("what does it matter what colour your cloth is?") versus the substance', or narrow-minded *smārta*-ism, because **obedience** is the substance. The distinction between the form and the substance in *bhakti*-practise is nowhere made in the Gosvāmīs' books; it is typical western logic and it is *māyāvāda* too. There are no external and internal items of *bhakti*, it is all transcendental – *sevā sādhaka rūpeṇa*. The Gosvāmīs have prohibited red cloth and wore white themselves, and *bhakti* means that you obey the

orders of those who are both ordered and empowered by Mahāprabhu to lay down the law. Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī comments on Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu (1.2.295) *sādhaka rūpeṇa tu kāyikyādi sevā tu śrī rūpa sanātanādi vrajavāsi janānām anusāreṇa kartavyetyarthaḥ* "Following in the footsteps of the residents of Vraja in the physical body means one must serve in adherence to Śrī Rūpa and Sanātana." Since they wore white, all Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava *sādhakas* should follow suit. Therefore to say you're wearing saffron, not red will not help, because nowhere is any other color than white prescribed.

rakta vastra vaiṣṇavera poḍite nā yuyāy

(Sanātana Gosvāmī in Caitanya Caritāmṛta Antya 13,61)

"A Vaiṣṇava should not wear red cloth."

This verse is not taken out of context here. The story indeed is a personal question between Jagadānanda Paṇḍit and Sanātan Gosvāmī, but the morale of the story, expressed in the *rakta vastra*-verse, is an objective, absolute statement. The verse says *vaiṣṇavera,* of the Vaiṣṇava in general, not *tomāra,* only yours.

This verse is met with a volley of excuses by Gauḍīya Maṭha and ISKCON-leaders-

1. A.C. Bhaktivedānta Swāmi translates it as "This saffron cloth is unfit for a Vaiṣṇava to wear' but the word 'this' (*ei*) is not in the verse. It is a general prohibition.

2. Others say the verse forbids red (*rakta*), not saffron cloth, but there are also injunctions in *śāstra* for wearing white, no other colour.

3. Other Gauḍīya Maṭha-ers say it forbids only wearing saffron on the head, as if Vaiṣṇavas should wear red cloth all over their bodies, but only wear white turbans, which is absurd. Besides, most members of Gauḍīya Ṁaṭha, including its founder, wore and wear saffron turbans too.

In Haribhakti Vilāsa (4.147) it is said: *nagno rakta paṭaḥ* "For a Vaiṣṇava, wearing red cloth is like being naked.", and: *śukla-vāso bhaven nityaṁ raktaṁ caiva vivarjayet* (4.152) "A Vaiṣṇava should always wear white cloth and give up red cloth."

dhārayed vāsasi śuddhe paridhānottarīyake
acchinna sudaśe śukle ācamet pīṭha saṁsthitaḥ

"One must wear clean *dhoti* and *chador*, untorn and **white**, then take a seat and do *ācamana."* (4.161)

kṛtopavāsaḥ śiṣya atha prāta-kṛtyaṁ vidhāya saḥ
***śukla-vastraḥ** suveśaḥ san viprān dravyena toṣayet*

"The candidate for *dīkṣā* should fast and finish his morning duties. Dressed in a **nice white garment** he should satisfy the *brāhmaṇas* with gifts. (Haribhakti Vilāsa 2.110)

Gauḍīya Maṭha-*ācāryas* then claim that their ochre *sannyāsa* is endorsed by Śrī Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī's 'Saṁskāra Dīpikā' (*kutsitaṁ malinaṁ vāso varjanīyaṁ viśeṣataḥ kaṣāya-rahitaṁ vastraṁ)*. However:

a) Saṁskāra Dīpikā is nowhere mentioned as written by Śrī Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī, in any authoritative index of the Gosvāmīs' books, and contains modern Bengali words like *bhek*, Bengali for *veśa* or *sannyāsa*, but meaning 'frog' in Sanskrit. It also controversially claims that Nityānanda Prabhu gave *kaupina* etc. to Raghunātha dāsa Goswāmī.

b) If Saṁskāra Dīpikā were written by Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī it would contradict Sanātan Gosvāmī's statements in 'Caitanya Caritāmṛta' and Haribhakti Vilāsa against red cloth.

Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī and Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī comment on Bhakti rasāmṛta sindhu 1.2.113 – *śiṣyān naivānubadhnīyād ity ādiko yadyapi sannyāsi-dharmas tathāpi **nivṛttānām apy anyeṣāṁ bhaktānām** upayujyata iti bhāvaḥ -*

"Though this rule (of not taking disciples, from Śrīmad-Bhāgavat 7.13.8, quoted here by Rūpa Gosvāmīpāda) applies to *sannyāsī-dharma* it also applies to **others, like renounced devotees.**"

In other words, the renounced order of devotees is different from (red cloth) *sannyāsa*. The red cloth discussed here was attained from a *sannyāsī – mukunda sarasvatī nāma sannyāsī mahājane; eka bahirvāsa teho dilo sanātane* (Caitanya Caritāmṛta Antya 13.50) "The great *sannyāsī* named Mukunda Sarasvatī gave an outer cloth to Sanātan Gosvāmī."

4) DEVIATING FROM THE *ŚĀSTRAS* (as is the case with giving *brāhmaṇa*-threads to men not born in Brāhmaṇa families, the wrong teaching on *adhikāra* for *rāgānugā*

bhakti, the origin of the *jīva* and many other issues pointed out in this essay) is often justified with the argument: "Yes, Prabhupāda/Bhaktisiddhānta was a pure devotee, therefore he was empowered to introduce new injunctions." A genuine pure devotee, however, will surrender to the *śāstras* –

tasmacchāstraṁ pramāṇaṁ te kāryākārya vyavasthitau
jñātvā śāstra vidhānoktaṁ karma kartum ihārhasi (Bhagavad Gītā 16.24)

"Therefore one should follow the scriptural authority in what is to be done and what is not to be done. Once knowing the scriptural injunctions, one should act accordingly."

APARĀDHA-ISSUE

5) VAIṢṆAVA NINDĀ — Even if there would be any kind of *paramparā* in Gauḍīya Maṭh/Iskcon, their initiation must still be rejected on the ground of their systematic and collective **slander** of the Vaiṣṇavas, that they are not even acquainted with, which makes it **prejudiced** as well. Each and every non-ISKCON/Gauḍīya Maṭha devotee is routinely called a *sahajīya.* Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī quotes Nārada Pancarātra in Paragraph 238 of Bhakti Sandarbha:

yo vakti nyāya rahitam anyāyena śṛṇoti yaḥ
tāv ubhau narakaṁ ghoraṁ vrajataḥ kālam akṣayam
iti nārada pañcarātre ataeva dūrata evārādhyas tādṛśo guruḥ
vaiṣṇava-vidveṣī cet parityajya eva -
guror apy avaliptasya kāryākāryam ajānataḥ
utpatha pratipannasya parityāgo vidhiyate
iti smaraṇāt tasya vaiṣṇava bhāva rāhityenāvaiṣṇavatayā 'avaiṣṇavopadiṣṭenaḥ'
ityādi vacana viṣayāc ca

"A person who speaks contrary to the morale and the person who hears such immoral teachings will both live in a foul hell for eternity. The association of such a Guru should be given up and he should be worshipped from a distance. If the Guru is an enemy of the Vaiṣṇavas he should be given up altogether. A Guru who is arrogant, who does not know what is to be done and what is not to be done, or who deviates

from the path must be abandoned. He has no Vaiṣṇava-feelings, therefore he is an *avaiṣṇava* (non-devotee). The scriptural saying "A *mantra* received from an *avaiṣṇava* will drag one to hell" also shows that an *avaiṣṇava guru* is to be abandoned."

satāṁ nindāṁ paramam aparādhaṁ vitanute — "Criticising saints is the first and foremost offence to the holy name." Unless one gives up the company of such a critic one is sure to fall down. Śrīmad Bhāgavata (10.74.40) confirms this:

nindaṁ bhagavataṁ śṛṇvan tat-parasya janasya vā
tato nāpaiti yaḥ so'pi yātyadhaḥ sukṛtāccyuta

"Anyone who hears the Lord or His devotee (*tat-parasya janasya vā*) blasphemed, and does not leave, will fall down."

b) *rāgānugā bhaktas* are not *sahajīyas*, for *sahajīyas* are *śāktas* or *māyāvādīs* that have Tantric sex with other men's wives, identifying themselves with Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, and most *rāgānugā bhaktas* don't do this. There is a tendency among the followers of Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī to lump in *bābājīs, rasika bhaktas, rāgānuga vaiṣṇavas* and *sahajīyās*, whereas these are not the same. The word *sahajīya* is not mentioned anywhere in the scriptures or the Gosvāmīs' books, with any kind of meaning attached to it.

Having said that, there was (in Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī's time) and is still (nowadays) a lot of immorality going on in Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava communities and Bhaktisiddhānta rightfully condemned it (his own followers aren't exactly immune to immoral behaviour either, though). One should be very careful, though, not to tar all Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas with the same brush. Generalisation inevitably leads to Vaiṣṇava-*aparādha*.

6) DEVOTIONAL BOASTING AND CHALLENGING IS AN OFFENCE TO THE HOLY NAME

"Our Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement was started single-handedly, and no one provided for our livelihood, but at present we are spending hundreds and thousands of dollars all over the world, and the movement is increasing more and more."

Bhaktivedānta Purport to Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Ādi 7.24

"Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura tried his best to spread the cult of Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu to countries outside India. When he was present he patronized the disciples to go outside India to preach the cult of Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu, but they were unsuccessful because within their minds they were not actually serious about preaching His cult in foreign countries; they simply wanted to take credit for having gone to foreign lands and utilize this recognition in India by advertising themselves as repatriated preachers. Many svāmīs have adopted this hypocritical means of preaching for the last eighty years or more, but no one could preach the real cult of Kṛṣṇa consciousness all over the world. They merely came back to India falsely advertising that they had converted all the foreigners to the ideas of Vedānta or Kṛṣṇa consciousness, and then they collected funds in India and lived satisfied lives of material comfort. As one fans paddy to separate the real paddy from useless straw, by accepting the criterion recommended by Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī one can very easily understand who is a genuine worldpreacher and who is useless." - Bhaktivedānta Purport to Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Ādi 12.12

Śrīla Sanātana Gosvāmī writes in Haribhakti Vilāsa (11.524) about the 10th offence to the holy name –

ahaṁ mamādi paramo nāmni so'py aparādha kṛt ||524||
kiṁ ca nāmny eva viṣaye yo'haṁ-mamādi-paramaḥ. ahaṁ bahutara-nāma-kīrtaka itas tato nāma-kīrtanaṁ ca mat-pravartitam eva mayā samo nāma-kīrtana-paro'nyaḥ kaḥ.

"To think 'I' and 'mine' to be the greatest in connection with the holy name is the 10th offence to the holy name" - *aham bahutara nāma kīrtaka* "I am the greater chanter of the holy name", *itas tato nāma-kīrtanaṁ ca mat-pravartitam eva, mayā samo nāma-kīrtana-paro'nyaḥ kaḥ* - "Only I am spreading the chanting of the holy name all over the world, who is equal to me in dedication to *nāma kīrtan*?"

***RĀGĀNUGĀ*-ISSUE**

7) Who is in ***ŚĀNTA RASA* IN VRAJA?**

A.C. Bhaktivedānta Swami writes in his purport on Caitanya-caritamrta (Madhya-līlā 22.161:)

"There are four moods of service which are included in the path of spontaneous devotion: those of the servants, friends, parents and conjugal lovers."): "Those desiring to serve in the devotional mellow of neutrality (śānta-rasa) should aspire to be like the cows, sticks, buffalo horns, the flute, kadamba trees and so forth."

Refutation:

dāsa-sakhā-pitrādi-preyasīra gaṇa
rāga-mārge nija-nija-bhāvera gaṇana

"In *rāgānugā bhakti* each devotee is counted in their own group – servant, friend, parent or lover." **(**Caitanya-caritāmṛta Madhya-līlā 22.161) In the verse four *rasas* are mentioned, but in his purport **A.C. Bhaktivedānta Swami** mentions five. The other instance is in Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī's Anubhāṣya on Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 8.294, *vraja yamunā-salila, pulina-bālukā, kadamba-vṛkṣādi, go-vetra-veṇu prabhṛti śānta-rasera vigraha-samūha*, paraphrased in **A.C. Bhaktivedānta Swami**'s commentary:

"Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura points out that in Vrajabhūmi there is the Yamunā River with its sandy banks. There are kadamba trees, cows, Kṛṣṇa's sticks with which He herds cows, and Kṛṣṇa's flute. All of these belong to śānta-rasa, the mellow of neutrality in devotional service....."

Refutation: Mahāprabhu proclaims in Caitanya Caritāmṛta that He makes the three worlds dance in four *rasas,* not in five - *cāri bhāva bhakti diyā nācāimu bhuvana* (Caitanya-caritāmṛta Ādi 3.19). And:

dāsya, sakhya, vātsalya ār ye śṛṅgāra;
cāri prema, catur-vidha bhaktai ādhāra

(Caitanya-caritāmṛta Ādi 4.42) There are four types of *prema* : servanthood, fraternity, parenthood and amorous love, that have four types of devotee as receptacle." Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartī says in his commentary on Śrīmad Bhāgavata (11.12.8) *gāvo vātsalya rasena. nagā govardhanādi parvatāḥ sakhyarasena* that mountains like Girirāja are in *sakhya rasa* and Vraja's cows are in *vātsalya rasa*. He repeats that the cows are in *vātsalya rasa* in his comments on **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 10.14.30-31** - *aho'ti-dhanyā ityādibhīrāmātmaka vātsalyādi ratimanta eva stoṣyanti* (30)

ye tu tvad bhakteṣv ati-prakṛṣṭās teṣāṁ tvayi śuddha vātsalyādi rati-bhājāṁ padavīṁ prārthayitum ayogyā... (31) "I am not qualified to pray for their *vātsalya rasa*"), **10.20.26** (*prītyā* is motherly affection) **10.21.13** - "The cows (not the calves) are in *vatsalya rasa- na ca tatrāpi vātsalyabhāva eva mohane hetur astīti vācyam*….., and "The cows stand still as they take Govinda within their hearts through their tear-filled eyes and embrace Him out of *vātsalya bhava – sva manasaḥ kroḍe eva vātsalyāt sthāpayantyas tasthuḥ* (Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartī's commentary) and **10.21.16** The clouds are in *sakhya rasa (sakhyur vyadhāt) – hanta hanta sakhya-bhāva-vanto'pyātmānaṁ kṛtārthayantītyāhuḥ* – The *gopīs* lament about the clouds "Alas! Alas! Even those who are in the mood of friendship with Kṛṣṇa (*sakhya bhāva*) have become blessed by serving Him." *svīya vidyud garjanābhyāṁ pīta-vastra veṇu-nādayoḥ sāmyaṁ dṛṣṭvā ca sakhibhāvam abhimanyamānaḥ* "Seeing he is equal to Kṛṣṇa with the rumbling sounds he makes, with his lightning (in the form of Kṛṣṇa's yellow cloth) the cloud identifies himself in *sakhya-rasa*." (Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartī's commentary) The statement *vaṁśī priya sakhī* from Brahma Samhitā (5.56) shows that Kṛṣṇa's flute is even in *madhura rasa*.

8) 'WHY IT HAS TO BE ALWAYS *GOPĪ BHĀVA*? Why not become a cowherd boy?"

Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī praises Mahāprabhu as the bringer of the ***unnatojjvala rasa***, the elevated divine erotic flavour, and this statement is quoted in the introduction of Caitanya Caritāmṛta as essential. The progressive discussion of Rāmānanda Rāya with Mahāprabhu also drives home that conclusion and Caitanya Caritāmṛta (Ādi 4.44-45) says:

taṭastha ho-iyā mane vicāra yadi kari
saba rasa hoite śṛṅgāre adhika mādhurī

taṭa-stha ha-iyā—becoming impartial; mane—in the mind; vicāra—consideration; yadi—if; kari—doing; saba rasa—all the mellows; haite—than; śṛṅgāre—in conjugal love; adhika—greater; mādhurī—sweetness.

But if we compare the sentiments in an impartial mood, we find that the conjugal sentiment is superior to all others in sweetness.

PURPORT

No one is higher or lower than anyone else in transcendental relationships with the Lord, for in the absolute realm everything is equal. But although these

relationships are absolute, there are also transcendental differences between them. Thus the transcendental relationship of conjugal love is considered the highest perfection.

Ādi 4.45 -

yathottaram asau svāda-viśeṣollāsamayy api
ratir vāsanayā svādvī bhāsate kāpi kasyacit

yathā-uttaram—one after another; asau—that; svāda-viśeṣa—of particular tastes; ullāsa-mayī—consisting of the increase; api—although; ratiḥ—love; vāsanayā—by the different desire; svādvī—sweet; bhāsate—exists; kā api—any; kasyacit—of someone (the devotee).

TRANSLATION

“Increasing love is experienced in various tastes, one above another. But that love which has the highest taste in the gradual succession of desire manifests itself in the form of conjugal love.”

PURPORT

This is a verse from Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī’s Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu (2.5.38).

The Caitanya Caritāmṛta is the gist of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava religion, the ultimate statement, and it opens with this verse of Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī, stating the purpose of Śrī Caitanya’s advent:

anarpita-carīṁ cirāt karuṇayāvatīrṇaḥ kalau
samarpayitum unnatojjvala-rasāṁ sva-bhakti-śriyam
hariḥ puraṭa-sundara-dyuti-kadamba-sandīpitaḥ
sadā hṛdaya-kandare sphuratu vaḥ śacī-nandanaḥ

anarpita—not bestowed; carīm—having been formerly; cirāt—for a long time; karuṇayā-by causeless mercy; avatīrṇaḥ—descended; kalau—in the Age of Kali; samarpayitum—to bestow; unnata—elevated; ujjvala-rasām—the conjugal mellow; sva-bhakti—of His own service; śriyam—the treasure; hariḥ—the Supreme Lord; puraṭa—than gold; sundara—more beautiful; dyuti—of splendor; kadamba—with a multitude; sandīpitaḥ—lighted up; sadā—always; hṛdaya-kandare—in the cavity of the heart; sphuratu—let Him be manifest; vaḥ—your; śacī-nandanaḥ—the son of mother Śacī.

TRANSLATION

May the Supreme Lord who is known as the son of Śrīmatī Śacīdevī be transcendentally situated in the innermost chambers of your heart. Resplendent with the radiance of molten gold, He has appeared in the Age of Kali by His causeless mercy to bestow what no incarnation has ever offered before: the most sublime and radiant mellow of devotional service, the mellow of conjugal love.

All translations by: A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami

The standard songs in the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Sampradāya (not just ISKCON or the Gauḍīya Maṭh but all other groups as well) all point at *gopī-bhāva* and *madhura rasa upāsana*. The Tulasī-ārati for instance:

*ei nivedana dharo, **sakhīra anugata** koro*
*sevā adhikāra diye koro nija **dāsī***

'This I submit to you – follow the *sakhīs*, and make me your maidservant by giving me to right to serve you."

And the Gurvaṣṭakam (6):

nikuñja yūnoḥ rati keli siddhyai yā yālibhir yuktir apekṣanīya
tatrāti dākṣād ati ballabhasya vande guroḥ śrī-caraṇāravindam

"The spiritual master is very dear, because he is expert in assisting the gopis, who at different times make different tasteful arrangements for the perfection of Radha and Kṛṣṇa's conjugal loving affairs within the groves of Vrndavana. I offer my most humble obeisances unto the lotus feet of such a spiritual master. "

Translation: A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami.

Furthermore, the **Kāma-Gāyatrī** is given to all Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas, indicating that Kṛṣṇa needs to be worshipped as the transcendental Cupid of Vṛndāvana. How would that fit in with being a cowherd boy, parent and male servant of Kṛṣṇa?

There is also not a single Vaiṣṇava community in the world which practises cowherdboy-, parent- or servant *rasa*.

9) QUALIFICATION FOR *RĀGĀNUGĀ BHAKTI-*

rāgānugā bhakti means allegiance to the eternally perfect *rāgātmikā*-devotees of Vraja. Such is the teaching of Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī in Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu (1.2.271):

virājantīm abhivyaktaṁ vrajavāsī janādiṣu
rāgātmikām anusṛtā yā sā rāgānugocyate

Before we speak of *rāgātmikā bhakti* and *rāgānugā bhakti* we must first know what is *rāga*. ***Rāga*** is that deep natural loving thirst which causes us to become completely absorbed in our beloved deity:

iṣṭe svārasikī rāgaḥ paramāviṣṭatā bhavet
tanmayī yā bhaved bhaktiḥ sātra rāgātmikoditā

(Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.2.272)

Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī has defined *rāga* and *rāgānuga* as follows:

tatra viṣayiaḥ svābhāviko viṣaya saṁsargecchātiśayamayaḥ premā rāga yathā cakṣurādīnāṁ saundaryādau tādṛśa evātra bhaktasya śrī bhagavatyapi rāga ityucyate.....yasya pūrvokte rāga-viśeṣe rucir eva jātāsti na tu rāga-viśeṣa eva svayaṁ tasya tādṛśa rāga-sudhākara karābhāsa samullasita hṛdaya sphaṭika-maṇeḥ śāstrādi śrutāsu tādṛśyā rāgātmikāyā bhakteḥ paripāṭīṣvapi rucir jāyate. tatas tadīyaṁ rāgaṁ rucyānugacchantī sā rāgānugā tasyaiva pravartate (Bhakti Sandarbha 310).

"Rāga means the strong and natural desire of a sense-enjoyer for his beloved sense-objects. The senses, like the eyes, are naturally attracted to their objects, such as beautiful forms, and they need no encouragement in this. In the same way, when a devotee's heart is naturally attracted to the Lord and he has a deep thirst for the Lord then this is called *rāga*. When a mere ray of the nectar-moon of such *rāga* falls on the crystal-like hearts of those devotees who only have some taste for a particular *rāga* but do not possess that *rāga* itself yet, then the heart rejoices and as a result of hearing from the scriptures and saints taste will be born within the heart of such a devotee for the devotional expertise of a *rāgātmika bhakta*. This means that *ruci* (taste) will be born within the heart when we hear about the loving devotional expertise of a *rāgātmika vraja-bhakta* from the scriptures or from the mouth of a saint whose heart is

pure, that is, free from lust, anger and envy. The devotion which follows the *rāga* of a *rāgātmikā* Vraja-devotee along with *ruci* is called ***rāgānugā bhakti***".

Both the *vidhi*-devotee and the *rāga*-devotee may therefore begin, simultaneously, with the path of devotion, from the stage of *anartha nivṛtti*, cessation of unwanted habits, progressing through the stages that have been described by Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī in his Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.4.15-16 (*ādau śraddhā tathā sādhu saṅgo'tha bhajana kriyā*). The difference between them lies not in personal purity, but in their mood. In other words, *rāgānuga bhakti* runs parallel with *vaidhi bhakti*, and not only sequentially. Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī writes in Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu (1.2.291):

rāgātmikaika niṣṭhā ye vrajavāsī janādayaḥ
teṣāṁ bhāvāptaye lubdho bhaved atrādhikāravān

"Those who are anxious ('greedy') to attain the mood of the eternal, exclusively fixed-up Rāgātmika Vrajavāsīs, are eligible to enter into Rāgānugā Bhakti." The *rāga* devotee is under the divine illusion that Kṛṣṇa is equal or inferior to him, following in the footsteps of the inhabitants of Vraja (*vrajalokānusārataḥ*, Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu), whose attitude of intimate, spontaneous love, free from awe and reverence, is described in the Tenth Canto of Śrīmad Bhāgavata.

***rāgānugā bhakti* is not only for perfected souls beyond the stage of *anartha nivṛtti*-**

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami comments on Caitanya Caritamṛta, Madhya 22.153:

"An advanced devotee is attracted by the service rendered by an eternal servitor of the Lord. This attraction is called spontaneous attraction. Technically it is called svarupa-upalabdhi. This stage is not achieved in the beginning. In the beginning one has to render service strictly according to the regulative principles set forth by the revealed scriptures and the spiritual master. By continuously rendering service through the process of vaidhi bhakti, one's natural inclination is gradually awakened. That is called spontaneous attraction, or rāgānugā bhakti.

It is not a fact that *rāgānugā bhakti* comes after the stage of *sādhanā bhakti* (devotion in practise). First of all, what is *sādhana bhakti*? Śrīla **Rūpa Gosvāmī** says in **Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.2.2:** *kṛti-sādhya bhavet sādhya bhāvā sā sādhanābdhidhā* - "That goal of *bhāva bhakti* is to be attained through practise with the senses (*kṛti*). This is called *sādhanā*." **Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.2.5** then declares: *vaidhi rāgānuga ceti sa dvidha sādhanābhidhā* – "There are two kinds of *sādhana — vaidhi* and *rāgānugā"* Nowhere it is said that *rāgānugā bhakti* is a post graduate state of *vaidhi bhakti.* **C.C. Madhya 22,108** confirms this— *ei sādhana bhakti dui to prakāra; eka vaidhi bhakti—rāgānugā bhakti āra:* "There are two kinds of devotion in practise. One is called *vaidhi bhakti* and the other *rāgānugā bhakti."* Different *ācāryas* that follow Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī claim that *rāgānugā bhakti* commences at the stage of *niṣṭha, ruci* or even *bhāva,* but there is not a word of evidence for that in the authorised scriptures on the topic, like Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu or its commentaries, Bhakti Sandarbha, Mādhurya Kādambinī or Rāga Vartma Candrikā. **Caitanya Caritāmṛta (Ādi 4, 231-232, 235-237)** declares:

e sob siddhānta gūḍh – kohite nā juwāy; nā kohile keho anta nāhi pāy
ataeva kohi kichu koriyā nigūḍh; bujhibe rasik bhakta nā bujhibe mūḍha

……

abhakta uṣṭrera ithe nā hoy pravesh; tabe cite hoy mora ānanda viśesh
ye lāgi kohite bhoy, se yadi nā jāne; ihā boi kibā such āche tribhuvane
ataeva bhaktagane kore namaskāra; nihśanke kohiye tār hauk camatkāra

"All these topics are confidential and shouldn't be discussed, but if they were not discussed then no one would be able to find out about them. Hence I will disclose some confidential matters now, which will be understood by *rasik*a devotees, but not by the fools...If the camel-like non-devotees cannot grasp such topics then I will be in ecstasy. What greater joy could there be in the three worlds if they, for whom I fear to speak out, will not know of this? Therefore I offer my respects to the devotees and speak out fearlessly. Let the devotees be astonished about what I am about to disclose!" **Śrīmad Bhāgavata (10.33.36)** declares:

anugrahāya bhūtānāṁ mānuṣāṁ deham āsthitaḥ;
bhajate tādṛśiḥ krīḍā yāḥ śrutvā tat-paro bhavet

“Śrī Kṛṣṇa performed the Rāsa-*līlā* out of compassion for **all conditioned souls** and anyone who hears of this becomes His devotee.” Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī comments in his Vaiṣṇava Toṣaṇī-comment on this verse:

ataeva tādṛśa bhakta prasaṅgena tādṛśīḥ sarva cittākarṣiīḥ krīḍā bhajate, yāḥ sādhāranair api śrutvā bhaktebhyo'nyo'pi janas tatparo bhavet. kim uta rāsa līlā rūpam imāṁ śrutvetyarthaḥ vakṣyate ca—vikrīḍitaṁ vrajavadhūbhir idaṁ ca viṣṇoḥ (S.B. 10.33.39) ityādi. yad vā mānuṣaṁ deham āśritaḥ sarvo'pi jīvas tatparo bhavet martyaloke śrī bhagavad avatārāt tathā bhajane mukhyatvācca manuṣyānām eva sukhena tac chravaṇādi siddheḥ.

"Kṛṣṇa performs this all-attractive pastime for His devotees, but even ordinary people are attracted to this game by hearing about it. Even they thus become exclusively devoted to the Lord. This will be further explained in verse 10.33.39. The words *mānuṣaṁ deham āśritaḥ* also indicate that the *jīvas* that attained a human form are able to hear of this pastime and thus become devotees. The Lord descends on the human planets and it is here that the worship of the Lord assumes its most important form. Hence human beings can blissfully attain perfection by hearing of this pastime." **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 10.33.39** declares that the senses do not become sexually agitated by hearing or reading of the Rāsa-*līlā,* but rather that they become freed from lust.

vikrīḍitaṁ vraja-vadhūbhir idam ca viṣṇoḥ
śraddhānvitaṁ nu'śṛṇuyed atha varṇayed yaḥ
bhaktiṁ paraṁ bhagavatiṁ pratilabhya kāmaṁ
hṛd rogam āśv apahinoty acirena dhīraṁ

"Anyone who faithfully hears and describes the pastimes of Lord Viṣṇu (Kṛṣṇa) with the ladies of Vraja (the *gopīs*) will attain supreme devotion to God and will soon become free from the heart's disease of lust." **Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī** comments as follows on this verse:

śraddhayā viśvāsenānvita iti. tad viparītāvajña rūpāparādha.....bhaktiṁ prema lakṣaṇāṁ parāṁ śrī gopikā premānusāritvāt sarvottama jātīyām. pratikṣaṇaṁ nūtanatvena labdhā hṛd roga rūpaṁ kāmam iti bhagavad viṣayaḥ kāma viśeṣo vyavacchinnaḥ tasya parama prema rūpatvena tad vaiparītyāt.....anyatra śruyate (śrī gītā 18.54) brahma bhūta prasannātmā na śocati na kāṅkṣati samaḥ sarveṣu bhūteṣu mad bhaktiṁ labhate

paraṁ. ityatra tu hṛd rogāpahānāt pūrvam eva parama bhakti prāptiḥ tasmāt parama balavad evedaṁ sādhanam iti bhāvaḥ

"*śraddhānvitā* means hearing with faith. This word is used to avoid the offence of disbelieving or disregarding the scriptures — that is contrary to the principles of hearing and chanting.....The highest devotion is that of the *gopīs* and hearing and chanting of their devotion is so powerful that this supreme devotion appears in the heart even before the heart's disease of lust is chased out of it.....This despite verse 18.54 of the Gītā, that shows an opposite sequence. This shows that hearing and chanting of the Rāsa-*līlā* is the most powerful *sādhana* in existence." Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī, in his commentary on the same verse, condemns those who do not believe this statement of the Bhāgavata, that *prema* comes before the cessation of lust, as *nāstikas,* or atheists, and *mūrkhas,* or fools— *dhīraḥ paṇḍita iti hṛd roge satyapi kathaṁ premā bhaved ityanāstikya lakṣaṇena mūrkhatvena rahita...*The word *yaḥ* is very significant. It means **anyone** who hears and describes this with faith. First the lamp (of pure love) is kindled, and then the darkness (of lust and ignorance) is destroyed. *rāgānugā bhakti*, (literally: following one's sacred passion) is therefore not necessarily only meant for the most advanced, purified souls. The distinction between practitioners of *vidhi bhakti* (compulsory devotion) and *rāga bhakti* (passionate devotion) is made because of their mood and attitude, not because of their possible different levels of purity. Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu pointed out to Vyenkata Bhaṭṭa (in **Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 9**) that the goddess of fortune performed many purifying austerities to attain the position of the *gopīs*, but that she could still not attain it because she lacked their sweet intimate attitude towards Him.

ei lāgi sukha bhoga chāḍi ciro-kāla;
vrata niyam kori tapa korilo apāra

"Just to associate with Kṛṣṇa, Lakṣmī gave up all sense enjoyment for long and performed severe austerities, following many regulative principles" (**Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 9, 113**) *rāsa na pāilo lakṣmī, śāstre iha śuni* — "Lakṣmī did not attain the Rāsa dance, I have heard from the revealed scriptures" (**Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 9, 120**)

vrajendra nandana boli' tāre jāne vrajajana; aiśvarya jñāne nāhi kon sambandha manana
vraja-lokera bhāve yei koroye bhajan; sei jana pāya vraje vrajendra nandana

"The people of Vraja know Him as the son of Vrajendra, and they consider that there can be no relationship with Him in awe and reverence. Those who worship Kṛṣṇa in the mood of the people of Vraja, will attain that Vrajendra-nandana in Vraja." **(Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 9,130-131**)

Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartīpāda writes in chapter 1 of **Mādhurya Kādambini**:

bhaktes tu 'vikrīḍitaṁ vrajavadhūbhiḥ' ityādau— bhaktiṁ parāṁ bhagavati pratilabhya kāmaṁ hṛd rogam āśvapahinotyacirena dhīraḥ (bhāg. 10.33.39) ityatra 'ktvā' pratyayena hṛd rogavatyevādhikāriṇi paramāyā api tasyāḥ prathamam eva praveśas tatas tayaiva parama svatantrayā kāmādīnām apagamaś ca. teṣāṁ kadācit sattve'pi 'api cet sudurācāro bhajate mam' iti 'bādhyamāno'pi mad bhakta' ityādibhiś ca tadvatāṁ na kvāpi śāstreṣu nindā leśo'pi.

“Although lust is also considered a fault on the path of *bhakti,* one can still enter the devotional path, despite being still afflicted by lust and other material desires. Śrīmad-Bhāgavata (10.33.39) says: “A person who faithfully hears or describes the Lord’s pastimes of *rāsa-līlā* with the *gopīs* of Vraja attains supreme devotion of the Lord. He quickly becomes steady and conquers over the senses, giving up lust, the disease of the heart.” In this text “after attaining supreme devotion” is an unfinished act, showing that *bhakti* can be attained even though one has lusty desires. This shows the most independent nature and power of *bhakti* to destroy lusty desires. Sometimes lusty desires exist even while practicing devotion. From verses like, “If the most sinful person worships Me exclusively...” (Gītā 9.30) and “Though my devotee is afflicted by lusty desires...” (Ś.B. 11.14.18) it is clear that though lusty desires may exist in a devotee, still he is not condemned even slightly.”

There is no guarantee that someone who practises *vaidhi bhakti* is automatically promoted to *rāgānugā bhakti,* rather Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī says in Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu *kṛṣṇa tad bhakta kāruṇya mātra lābhaika hetukā* "Only by the grace of Kṛṣṇa and His devotees this path of *rāgānugā bhakti* is attained." **Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī** says in **Padyāvalī**:

kṛṣṇa bhakti rasa bhāvitā matiḥ krīyatāṁ yadi kuto'pi labhyate
tatra laulyam api mūlyam ekalaṁ janma koṭi sukṛtair na labhyate

"No ten million lifetimes of following regulative principles will give you taste for Kṛṣṇa-*bhakti.* The only price is greed! Purchase it as soon as it is available anywhere!" It is on sale where the *rasika bhaktas* speak about Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa.

In connection with the above *śloka,* the saying "*Fools rush in where Angels fear to tread"* has to be applied and judged according to the individual. It cannot be stated as a general rule.

Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartīpāda teaches in **Rāga Vartma Candrikā (1.5)**: *nāpi lobhanīya vastu prāptau svasya yogyāyogyatva vicāraḥ ko'py udbhavati:* "no candidate ever considers whether he is qualified for this path of *rāgānugā bhakti* or not"**.**

On the other hand, Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī says in Bhakti Sandarbha (276) that *smaraṇa* (even just of the holy name, let alone Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa's intimate *līlā)* requires a pure heart – *nāma smaraṇam tu śuddhāntaḥ-karaṇatām apekṣate*. Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī has also written (Bhakti Sandarbha 275): *atha śaraṇāpattyādibhiḥ śuddhāntaḥ karaṇaś cet....nāma sankīrtanāparityāgena smaranaṁ kuryat* "When the mind is purified by the process of surrender, one should practise the devotional item of recollection without giving up *nāma sankīrtana." kintu rahasya-līlā tu pauruṣa-vikāravad indriyaiḥ….. nopāsyā* "But the intimate pastimes should not be meditated upon by (those whose) senses are affected by masculine transformations." (Bhakti Sandarbha 338) When one is sensually or mentally overheated it is better not to read about Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa's intimate pastimes. When one is more grave the topic will work as a medicine, as has been promised by the Bhāgavata in the final verse of the Rāsa *līlā*-narration (10.33.39).

So who IS then unqualified to hear it?

This is also answered by Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī in his **Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhuḥ (3.5.2)**: *nivṛttānupayogitvā durūhatvād ayaṁ rasaḥ - nivṛtta* means 'those who have no taste for *madhura rasa'*. Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī comments *nivṛtteṣu prākṛta śṛṅgāra rasa sāmya dṛṣṭvyā bhāgavatād apy asmād rasād virakteṣvanupayogitvād ayogyatvāt* - "*nivṛttas* (those who are unattached to *madhurya rasa*) are unqualified because they cannot understand that the Lord has such amorous feelings as well. They see it as being the same." In other words, mistaking this *rasa* to be an ordinary mundane affair disqualifies one from entering into *rāgānugā bhajana.*

One cannot learn *vidhi bhakti* from the *guru* and then just learn *rāgānugā bhakti* from books, because your *guru* did not teach you *rāgānugā bhakti*. **Śrīla Raghunātha dāsa Gosvāmī** says: *asambhāṣya tad bhāva gambhīra cittān kuto śyāma sindho rasasyāvagāhaḥ* "How can one enter into the Śyāma-ocean without having conversed with a devotee whose heart is steeped in love for Rādhā?" Śrī **Viśvanātha Cakravartī** writes in his **Rāga Vartma Candrikā** (1.6).

sa ca bhagavat kṛpā hetuko'nurāgī bhakta kṛpā hetukaśceti dvividhaḥ. tatra bhakta kṛpā hetuko dvividhaḥ prāktana ādhunikaśca. prāktanaḥ paurvabhavika tādṛśa bhakta kṛpotthaḥ ādhunikaḥ etajjanmāvadhi tādṛśa bhakta kṛpotthaḥ. ādye sati lobhānantaraṁ tādṛśa guru caraṇāśrayaṇam. dvitīye guru caraṇāśrayānantaraṁ lobha pravṛttir bhavati.

"There are two causes for the appearance of sacred greed: The mercy of God or the mercy of an *anurāgī* devotee. There are again two kinds of mercy bestowed by a devotee: *prāktana* and *ādhunika*. *prāktana* means mercy bestowed by a *rāgānugā bhakta* in a previous life, and *ādhunika* is mercy bestowed in the present birth. The *prāktana*-devotee takes shelter of the lotus feet of a *rāgānugā guru* after the sacred greed has arisen in him, the *ādhunika* will get that sacred greed after surrendering to the feet of such a *guru*."

10) THE STOP-OVER THEORY –

B.R. Sridhara Maharaja –

“The Sahajiyas propagate that without directly receiving siddha-pranali (revelation of one's internal identity as a gopi) spiritual perfection is incomplete. Let them do so. Our Guru Maharaja wrote several poems, one of which is Prakrta-rasa Sata-dusani, 'A Hundred Defects in the Sahajiya Conception.' The defects are innumerable, but our Guru Maharaja put forward a hundred of the defects in their process of 'advancement.' Mainly they take spiritual advancement very cheaply; they are not prepared to pay the real price. But the death blow to them is this:

upajiya bāḍe latā 'brahmanda' bhedi' yaya; 'viraja,' brahmaloka, ' bhedi' 'paravyoma' paya
tabe yaya tad upari 'goloka-vrndavana'; 'Kṛṣṇa-carana'-kalpa-vrkse kare arohana

"As one waters the devotional creeper, the seed sprouts, and it gradually grows until it penetrates the walls of this material universe and goes beyond the Viraja River, which divides the spiritual world and the material world. It attains brahma-loka, and then reaches the paravyoma, the spiritual sky, and then reaches the foremost spiritual planet Goloka Vrndavana. Rooted in the heart and watered by sravana-kirtana, the bhakti creeper grows until it attains the shelter of the desire tree of the lotus feet of Kṛṣṇa in the topmost region of the spiritual sky." (C.c. Madhya-lila 19.153-4)

One must first cross the different gross and subtle layers of the brahmanda (mundane universe); then Viraja, the extremity of the jurisdiction of Maya, or misconception; then the Brahman conception, the halo of the real or transcendental world; then, Vaikuntha, which is Paravyoma, a sphere of consciousness.”

Refutation - This going through all the planes is an objective observation, not a personal course – 'Higher than this plane is that plane etc." Look in Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu - there is nothing said there about each *sādhaka* having to go through all these phases. This is a description of the ascension of *bhakti*, not the journey of the individual soul. It is just a general map to show how high Vraja-bhakti goes and IS. Like the Bṛhad Bhāgavatāmṛta. Is there anybody who first wants to go to heaven, then wants to do *yoga*, then become a cowherd boy, and then a *gopī? Śāstra* says there is one direct attainment for each path –

vidhi-bhaktye pārṣada-dehe vaikuṇṭhete yāy

(Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 24.87)

"Through *vidhi-bhakti*, one will attain the form of an associate in Vaikuṇṭha."

rāga-bhaktye vraje svayaṁ-bhagavāne pāy (Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 24.85)

"Through *rāga-bhakti*, one will attain the Lord Himself in Vraja."

11) DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN A.C. BHAKTIVEDANTA SWAMI'S 'NECTAR OF DEVOTION' AND THE TEACHINGS OF THE INITIAL *ĀCĀRYAS*:

A.C Bhaktivedānta Swāmī has given his own definition of *rasa* in the preface of the Nectar of Devotion:

That force which drives the philantropist, the householder and the nationalist is called rasa".

Instead, you have a *sthāyī bhāva*, then *vibhāva anubhāva* and *sañcārī bhāva*, all these things combined give a rise to *rasa*. But the above definition of *rasa* A.C Bhaktivedānta Swāmī gives has nothing to do with what Rūpa Goswāmī says.

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami's Nectar of Devotion, chapter 16 – "Eligibility for Spontaneous Devotional Service":

Opening paragraph: *“Persons desiring to follow in the footsteps of such eternal devotees of the Lord as the Vṛṣṇis and Vṛndāvana denizens are called rāgānugā devotees, which means that they are trying to attain to the perfection of those devotees. These rāgānugā devotees do not follow the regulative principles of devotional service very strictly, …”*

Response: This has turned out to be a disastrous statement when preaching to an audience of derelict western hippies – they now think that *rāgānugā bhakti* means one need not follow the principles of chastity and restraint and there are now those who preach that a life of illicit sex, drugs and rock music is *rāgānugā bhakti*. While Śrī Rūpa Gosvāmī never said that *rāgānugā bhakti* means one need not follow the rules. Rather, Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī has written a book, ‘Rāga Vartma Candrikā’ especially to warn against such a conception. He ends that book with:

ye tu rāgānugā bhaktiḥ sarvathaiva sarvadaiva śāstra-vidhim atikrāntā eva iti bruvate 'ye śāstra vidhim utsṛjya yajante śraddhayānvitaḥ'. iti 'vidhi hīnam asṛṣṭānnam' ityādi gītokter garhām arhanto muhur utpātam anubhūtavanto'nubhavanto'nubhaviṣyanti ca

“Those who say that *rāgānugā bhakti* totally surpasses all scriptural injunctions in all respects are denounced by Gītā-verses such as 'those who give up all scriptural injunctions to worship with mere faith', and 'food made without regulations', have always caused disturbance, are causing disturbance and will cause disturbance.”

“We must always remember, however, that such eagerness to follow in the footsteps of the denizens of Vraja is not possible unless one is freed from material contamination. In following the regulative principles of devotional service, there is a stage called anartha-nivrtti, which means the disappearance of all material contamination. Sometimes someone is found imitating such devotional love, but factually he is not freed from anarthas or unwanted habits…… When one is actually spontaneously attracted to the loving principles of the gopis, there will be found no trace of any mundane contamination in him.”

Response: In his <u>Raga-vartma-candrika</u> (1.8) however, **<u>Viśvanātha Cakravartī</u>** explains that *lobha* is not a black-and-white matter, that it is either absolute and complete, or there is none. Lobha is not necessarily a burning, all-consuming passion.

sa ca lobho rāga vartma vartināṁ bhaktānāṁ guru-padāśraya lakṣaṇam ārabhya svābhīṣṭa vastu sākṣāt prāpti samayam abhivyāpya yathā yathātma parimṛjyate'sau mat puṇya gāthā śravaṇābhidhānaiḥ tathā tathā paśyati vastu sūkṣmaṁ cakṣur yathaivāñjana samprayuktam iti bhagavad ukter bhakti hetukāntaḥ karaṇa śuddhi tāratamyāt prati dinam adhikādhiko bhavati.

"It is described that the devotees on the *rāga*-path gradually progress from the initial surrender to the feet of Śrī Guru up to the stage of directly attaining the object of their desires. 'When the eye is smeared with medicinal ointment, its ability of perception becomes more and more refined, and accordingly it is able to perceive more and more subtle objects; similarly, according to the degree of the mind's having become purified by hearing and chanting of My purifying pastimes, all the subtle truths of reality become manifest in the heart of the *sādhaka*.' From these words of the Lord (S.B. 11.14.26) it is known that through *sādhana-bhakti* the consciousness of the *sādhaka* becomes more purified every day, and he gradually becomes more and more greedy."

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami: *"In the stage of devotional service where regulative principles are followed, there is no necessity of discussing this love, for it must develop of itself at a more advanced stage."*

Response: This is not corroborrated by **Rūpa Gosvāmī.**

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami: *Therefore, in the beginning, everyone should strictly follow the regulative principles of devotional service, according to the injunctions of the scriptures and the spiritual master. Only after the stage of liberation from material contamination can one actually aspire to follow in the footsteps of the devotees in Vṛndāvana."*

Response: Rūpa Gosvāmī: *vaidhi rāgānugā ceti sa dvidha sādhanābhidha* (**Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.2.5**) - there are two kinds of *sādhana* (after first explaining that *sādhana bhakti* means practise with the senses, by souls that are still conditioned)— *vaidhi* and *rāgānugā*, and nowhere it is said that *rāgānugā bhakti* is a post graduate state of *vaidhi bhakti*. Visvanatha Cakravartipada states in his **Rāga Vartma Candrikā** (2.7) -

atha rāgānugā-bhakti - majjanasyānartha-nivṛtti-niṣṭhā-rucy-āsakty-antaram prema-bhūmikārūḍhasya sākṣāt svābhīṣṭa-prāpti-prakaraḥ pradarśyate

"Then it will be described how the one, who has progressed on the path of *rāgānugā-bhakti* through the cessation of the evils (*anartha-nivṛtti*), firmness (*niṣṭha*), taste (*ruci*), and attachment (*āsakti*) all the way to the attainment of ecstatic love (*prema*), will directly come to attain his desired object."

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami: *"In this connection, we should be careful about the so-called siddha-praṇāli. The siddha-praṇāli process is followed by a class of men who are not very authorized and who have manufactured their own way of devotional service."*

Response: That will include **Bhaktivinode Thākur**, whom A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami himself has made world-famous as an *ācārya*? Bhaktivinoda preaches *siddha-praṇālī* in his books Hari-nāma cintāmaṇi and Jaiva-dharma.

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami: *"They imagine that they have become associates of the Lord simply by thinking of themselves like that."*

Response: Yet, this is what the ***ācāryas*** say:

Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī says in **Bhakti Sandarbha** 286 (*tatra bhūta-śuddhir nijābhilaṣita bhagavat sevaupayogika tat pārṣada deha bhāvanā* – "*Bhūta śuddhi* means that one meditates on one's own desired *siddha deha* which is fit for serving the Lord".

Kṛṣṇadās Kavirāja in **Caitanya Caritāmṛta** (*mone nija siddha deha koriyā bhāvan*, 'Think of your own desired *siddha deha* as a *sādhana* (*ei sādhana bhakti dui to prakāra*, **Madhya 22.155-6**) and Rūpa Gosvāmī in that very same Nectar of Devotion – *siddha rūpena cātra hi* (**Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.2.295** plus its *ṭīkās* by **Jīva** and **Viśvanātha**). **Narottama dās** Thākur – *sādhane bhāvibe yāhā, siddha deha pābe tāhā* (**Premabhakti Candrikā**) – "Whatever *siddha deha* one thinks of during one's *sādhana* is what one attains in *siddha* stage." *rāgānugā mārge anutpanna rati sādhaka bhaktair api svepsita siddha dehaṁ manasi parikalpya* - 'On the *rāgānugā*-path even *sādhaka bhaktas* who have no *rati* yet can think of his own desired *siddha deha*." (Kṛṣṇadās Kavirāja's **Sāraṅga Rangadā** ṭīkā of Kṛṣṇa Karṇāmṛta - 3)

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami: *"This external behavior is not at all according to the regulative principles. The so-called siddha-praṇāli process is followed by the prākṛta-*

sahajiya, a pseudo sect of so-called Vaiṣṇavas. In the opinion of Rūpa Gosvāmī, such activities are simply disturbances to the standard way of devotional service."

Response: 1) Where does Rupa Gosvami say this in Bhakti Rasamrita Sindhu?

2) Bhaktivinode is a pseudo Vaiṣṇava called *prākrita sahajiya*? Why then call him the 7th Gosvāmī?

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami: *"Śrī Rūpa Gosvāmī says that learned ācāryas recommend that we follow the regulative principles even after the development of spontaneous love for Kṛṣṇa."*

Response: Here Swāmiji contradicts himself (see above: "These *rāgānugā* devotees do not follow the regulative principles of devotional service very strictly.")

Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī gives the following definition of pure devotion in **Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu (1.1.17)**

kleśaghni śubhadā mokṣa laghutākṛt sudurllabhā
sāndrānanda viśeṣātmā śrī kṛṣṇākarṣiṇī ca sā

"1. It destroys all grief and suffering, meaning sins, including the cause of sin, 2. it bestows auspiciousness, 3. it lightens the importance of liberation, 4. it is rare 5. it is deeply blissful and 6. it attracts Śrī Kṛṣṇa." In his commentary, Śrī **Viśvanātha Cakravartī** spells out: *tatra sādhana bhaktiḥ kleśaghīti śubhadā rūpā ca* – "The symptoms of *sādhana bhakti* are the first two items – destroying grief, or sin, and bestowing auspiciousness." The same Viśvanātha Cakravartī writes in his **Mādhurya Kādambini** (2.2):

sva-sparśeṇa sparśamaṇir iva karaṇa vṛttīr api prākṛtatva-lohatāṁ śanais-tyājayitvā cinmayatva śuddha jāmbunadatāṁ prāpayantyāḥ kandalībhāvānte samudgacchantyāḥ sādhanābhikhye dve patrike vivriyete. tayoḥ prathamā kleśaghnī dvitīyā śubdhadeti. dvayor api tayor antas tu lobha pravartakatva lakṣaṇa-caikkanyena 'yeṣām ahaṁ priya ātmā sutaś ca.' ityādi śuddha sambandha snigdhatayā ca prāptotkarṣe deśe rāga nāmno rājña evādhikāraḥ. bahis tu 'tasmād bhārata sarvātmā' ityādi śāstra pravartakatva lakṣaṇa-pāruṣyābhāsena priyādi śuddha sambandhābhāvāt svata evāti snigdhatānudayena pūrvataḥ kiñcid apakṛṣṭe deśe vaidha nāmno' parasya rājñaḥ. kleśaghnatva-śubhadatvābhyāntu prāyaśuyorṇa ko'pi viśeṣaḥ.

"Like a touchstone, this creeper of *bhakti* eventually transforms the iron-like material nature of the senses into the most pure transcendental gold. Gradually the *sādhana-bhakti* creeper sprouts and unfolds two leaves. The first is called *kleśaghni*, destroyer of material sufferings, and the second is called *śubhadā*, giver of all auspiciousness. The inner surface of the two leaves is the domain of the king called *rāga* (*rāgānugā* devotion), and is very smooth, the sign of its being born out of spontaneous greed. It is superior due to its appearance from the pure affectionate relation with the Lord as described in the Bhāgavata (3.25.38), "I am their dear one, very life, son,..." The outer surface of the leaves is ruled by another king known as *vaidha* (regulative devotion) and slightly rough in nature, the sign of its being born from the injunctions of the scriptures. It is somewhat inferior and slightly rough due to the lack of pure affectionate relation with the Lord. Śrīmad-Bhāgavata (2.1.5) says, "Therefore, persons desiring fearlessness should worship the Lord, the Supreme Self." **However, both *rāga* and *vaidhī*, almost equally manifest the symptoms of *kleśaghni* and *śubhadā*. "**

Here it is again proven that *rāgānugā bhakti* is, like *vaidhi bhakti*, a *sādhana* that starts from the beginning of *bhakti* practise. *rāga* is the inner leaf and *vaidhi* the outer.

Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravarti's *ṭīkā* of Bhakti Rasamṛta Sindhu 1.2.292-

tat-tad-bhāvādi-mādhurye śrī-bhāgavatādi-prasiddhāvatāra-līlā-varṇanamaya-śāstra-sāmānye śrute śravaṇa-dvārā ***yat kiñcid anubhūte*** *sati yacchāstraṁ vidhi-vākyaṁ nāpekṣate. yuktiṁ ca na kintu pravartata evety arthaḥ. tad eva lobhotpatter lakṣaṇam anumāpakaṁ tādṛśa-hetu-jñānād eva lobhotpattir anumīyate ity arthaḥ. na tv atra lakṣaṇaṁ lobhotpatteḥ svarūpam iti vyāhyātuṁ śakyaṁ śāstra-yuktāpekṣābhāvasya svarūpatvābhāvāt.*

Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī's ṭīkā of Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.2.292 -

tat-tad-bhāvādi-mādhurye śrī-bhāgavatādiṣu siddha-nirdeśa-śāstreṣu śrute śravaṇa-dvārā ***yat kiñcid*** *anubhūte sati yacchāstraṁ vidhi-vākyaṁ nāpekṣate. yuktiṁ ca kintu pravartata evety arthaḥ | tad eva lobhotpatter lakṣaṇam iti*

The meaning of both the above texts is identical - "When one **has got even a slight feeling** for the sweet moods of Kṛṣṇa and His devotees through hearing their descriptions in texts describing the ultimate spiritual goal, such as the Bhāgavata,)the

rāgānugā sadhaka) no longer waits for the injunctions of scripture or for logical reasons to do so, but simply takes up)the *rāgānugā* devotional path). This is the characteristic of *lobha*."

The words *yat kincit* prove that initial *lobha* is not an all-consuming fire.

12) *RĀGĀNUGĀ BHAKTI* STARTS AT THE STAGE OF *NIṢṬHĀ*?

In his book "Śrī Guru Paramparā - Bhaktisiddhanta Saraswati Thakur, Heir to the Esoteric Life of Kedaranatha Bhaktivinoda", **Tripurāri Swāmi** says that "*in Bhakti-sāra-pradarśinī (his commentary on Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu, ed.), Viśvanātha tells us that in order to practice rāgānugā bhakti one must have attained the stage of niṣṭhā.*"

Response:

rāgātmikaika niṣṭhā ye vrajavāsī janādayaḥ
teṣāṁ bhāvāptaye lubdho bhaved atrādhikāravān (B.R.S. 1.2.291)

is the verse referred to here. The words *eka niṣṭha* (exclusively fixed, loyal) have been mistranslated to refer to the *adhikaravān*, the *jīva*-candidate, and have been confused for the high stage of *bhakti* called *niṣṭhā*, but it refers instead to the *nitya siddha* rolemodel, the Vrajavāsīs, and means 'exclusive fixation' and not the stage of *niṣṭhā* that *sādhakas* must go through. This is what **Viśvanātha Cakravartīpāda** writes in his Bhakti Sāra Pradarśini-commentary on this verse - *rāgātmika bhaktau eka niṣṭhāṁ yeṣāṁ teṣāṁ vrajavāsinam śrī kṛṣṇe yo bhāvās tat sājātiya bhāvāptaye lubdha ityarthaḥ*. The word-for-word translation of this commentary runs as follows: *rāgātmikā bhaktau* = in *rāgātmikā bhakti* (of the *nitya siddha vrajavāsīs*, described in verse 270) *eka niṣṭhāṁ* = exclusively fixed. *yeṣāṁ* = of them, *teṣāṁ* = of exactly these same ones. *vrajavāsināṁ* = of the Vrajavāsīs. *śrī kṛṣṇe* = towards Śrī Kṛṣṇa. *yaḥ* = whatever. *bhāvaḥ* = feelings. *tat* = that. *sājātiya* = like-minded. *bhāva* = feeling. *āptaye* = for the sake of attaining. *lubdha* = greedy. *iti* = thus. *arthaḥ* = the meaning.

Here is that definition of the *rāgātmikā bhakti* of the *nitya siddha* Vrajavāsīs –

virājantīm abhivyaktaṁ vrajavāsi-janādiṣu
rāgātmikām anusṛtā yā sā rāgānugocyate

(Bhakti Rasāmṛta sindhu 1.2.270)

"The devotion which is clearly present in the associates of the Lord in Vraja is called devotion filled with loving attachment (*rāgātmika-bhakti*), and devotion following in the wake of this *rāgātmikā-bhakti* is called *rāgānugā-bhakti*."

As one desires to approach the Lord, so the Lord will approach the aspirant – *ye yathā māṁ prapadyante tāṁs tathaiva bhajāmyahaṁ* (Bhagavad-Gītā 4.11) Reflecting on these famous words of the Bhagavad Gita, one can easily understand that varieties of goals are attained in accordance with one's desires. It is not that all paths lead to the same goal.

vaidhī-rāgānugā-mārga-bhedena parikīrtitaḥ
dvividhaḥ khalu bhāvo'tra sādhanābhiniveśajaḥ

(Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.3.7)

"The paths of *vaidhi* and *rāgānugā* are known to be separate from each other. Engagement in these two forms of practice certainly awakens two distinct varieties of *bhāva*." This automatically shows that *rāgānugā bhakti* is not per se a post graduate phase of *vaidhi bhakti*. The symptoms of *bhāva* in either *vaidhi*- or *rāga-bhakti* are also described separately in Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.3.9 (*vaidhi*) and 1.3.14 (*rāga*). The symptoms of *prema* are described separately in Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.4.6 (*vaidhi*), and 1.4.7-8 (*rāga*). The goals of these two paths of devotion are understood as follows:

vidhi-bhaktye pārṣada-dehe vaikuṇṭhete yāy

(Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 24.87)

"Through *vidhi-bhakti*, one will attain the form of an associate in Vaikuṇṭha."

aiśvarya-jñāne vidhi-bhajana koriyā
vaikuṇṭhake yāya catur-vidha mukti pāyā

(Caitanya Caritāmṛta Adi 3.17)

"Those who worship according to scriptural commandments, being aware of the Lord's superhuman prowess, attain the four kinds of liberation in Vaikuṇṭha."

rāga-bhaktye vraje svayaṁ-bhagavāne pāy

(Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 24.85)

"Through *rāga-bhakti*, one will attain the Lord Himself in Vraja."

rāgānuga-mārge tāre bhaje yei jana; sei-jana pāya vraje vrajendra-nandana

(Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 8.221)

"He who worships on the path of *rāgānugā* will attain Vrajendra-nandana (Sri Kṛṣṇa) in Vraja."

In the realm of Vraja, the sweet and intimate **human-like pastimes of Kṛṣṇa** prevail. Only in such an atmosphere love can attain its pinnacle. Love which is filled with awareness of the Lord's almight is of an inferior quality. As stated by the Lord Himself:

sakala jagate more kore vidhi-bhakti; vidhi-bhaktye vraja-bhāva pāite nāhi śakti
aiśvarya-jñānete saba jagat miśrita ; aiśvarya-śithila-preme nāhi mora prīta

(Caitanya Caritāmṛta Adi 3.15-16)

"Everyone in this world worships Me through *vidhi-bhakti. vidhi-bhakti* has no power for attaining the feelings of Vraja. The devotion of the world is mixed with knowledge of My divine prowess.**I do not delight in love diluted with prowess."**

It is thus evident that there is a need to deeply reflect on the nature and practice of *rāgānugā-bhakti* for anyone who desires to perfect his loving faculty in relationship with God. **There is no other means for tasting the ambrosial sweetness of the Vraja-pastimes of the Lord!**

13) WHAT IS *RĀGĀTMIKĀ* AND WHAT IS *RĀGĀNUGĀ*?

In order to have a clear understanding about *rāgānugā* it is important to understand *rāga* and *rāgātmikā*. For various reasons these terms have been somewhat conflated and confused in ISKCON. *Rāga* has already been defined according to Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.2.272 as complete absorption in one's beloved deity:

iṣṭe svārasikī rāgaḥ paramāviṣṭatā bhavet
tanmayī yā bhaved bhaktiḥ sātra rāgātmikoditā

"rāga is defined as spontaneous, deep thirst for the object of love. *Bhakti* that is impelled exclusively by such a thirst is called *rāgātmikā-bhakti."*

This absorption, described here as *rāgātmikā bhakti* and is only found in Kṛṣṇa's eternal associates in Vraja as Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.2.270 confirms:

Rāgānugā-bhakti is defined as that *bhakti* which follows after the *rāgātmikā-bhakti* which manifests distinctively in the inhabitants of Vraja.

In the 22nd Chapter of Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Madhya Lila, this is also described, but in the word for word translation AC Bhaktivedānta Swami uses the term spontaneous devotional service for *rāgātmikā* as well as *rāgānugā bhakti.*

Quoting Jīva Gosvāmī's Bhakti-sandarbha in Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 22.149,
tad evaṁ tat-tad-abhimāna-lakṣaṇa-bhāva-viśeṣeṇa svābhāvika-rāgasya vaiśiṣṭye sati tat-tad-rāga-prayuktā śravaṇa-kīrtana-smaraṇa-pāda-sevana-vandanātma-nivedana-prāyā bhaktis teṣāṁ rāgātmikā bhaktir ity ucyate. . . . tatas tadīyaṁ rāgaṁ rucyānugacchantī sā rāgānugā.

AC Bhaktivedanta Swami translates,

"When a pure devotee follows the footsteps of a devotee in Vṛndāvana, he develops rāgānugā bhakti."

There is no mention of "pure devotee" here.

In Nectar of Devotion Ch. 15, entitled "Spontaneous Devotional Service" some mistakes have led to much confusion:

"The examples of spontaneous devotional service can be easily seen in Kṛṣṇa's direct associates in Vrindavan. The spontaneous dealings of the residents of Vrindavan in relationship with Kṛṣṇa are called rāgānugā."

The proper term here is *rāgātmikā,* rather than *rāgānugā.*

In the next paragraph it says,

"Srila Rupa Goswami has defined rāgānugā bhakti as spontaneous attraction for something while completely absorbed in thoughts of it."

The word here should be *rāga*, not *rāgānugā bhakti.*

If *rāgātmikā* and *rāgānugā* are translated identically and even used interchangeably we need not be surprised about the mistaken notion that this is a highly elevated stage of *bhakti* which is only achieved in a completely purified stage.

14) THE *SIDDHA DEHA*

In his translations of Caitanya Caritāmṛta (Madhya 8,229; Madhya 22, 155-158) A.C. Bhaktivedānta Svāmī suggests that to meditate on the *siddha deha* one needs to be 'self-realised', while such a word cannot be found in the original verses. **Śrīla Narottama dāsa ṭhākura** explains that meditation on the *siddha deha* is a regular *sādhana*:

sādhane bhāvibe yāhā, siddha dehe pābe tāhā
rāga mārge ei sei upāya

"Whatever you think of during your *sādhana*, you will attain in your *siddhi*-body. Those are the ways of *rāga mārga.*(**Prema Bhakti Candrikā 57**)"

sādhane ye dhana cāi, siddha dehe tāhā pāi,
pakkāpakka mātra se vicāra

"The treasure I covet during my *sādhanā* I will receive in my *siddha* body. The only difference between the two is being ripe and unripe. (Prema Bhakti Candrikā 56)"

This means that the difference between the struggling practitioner and the *siddha* is only in quantity and not in quality. **Bhagavad Gītā (8,6)** says —

yaṁ yaṁ vāpi smaran bhāvan tyajantyante kalevaram
taṁ tam evaiti kaunteya sadā tad bhāva bhāvita

"Whatever one contemplates throughout life is what one attains when one leaves the body."

kīṭaḥ peśaskṛtāruddhaḥ kuḍyāyāṁ tam anusmaran
saṁrambha bhaya yogena vindate tat svarūpatām

"The caterpillar imprisoned by a wasp in (its nest on) a wall, and constantly thinking of the latter through intense hate and fear, attains the form of the wasp." (Śrīmad Bhāgavata 7.1.27) **Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.2.295—**

sevā sādhaka rūpeṇa siddha rūpeṇa cātra hi;
tad bhāva lipsunā kāryā vraja lokānusārataḥ

"A person who desires loving attraction to His beloved deity Śrī Kṛṣṇa in Vraja must serve in allegiance to the people of Vraja, both in the current practitioner's body as well as in the spiritual, mentally conceived body, which is fit for serving the beloved deity." Commentary by **Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī:** *tathāca siddha-rūpeṇa mānasī sevā śrī rādhā-lalitā-viśākhā śrī rūpa manjaryādīnām anusāreṇa kartavyā. sādhaka rūpeṇa tu kāyikyādi sevā tu śrī rūpa sanātanādi vrajavāsi janānām anusāreṇa kartavyetyarthaḥ* "Mental service must be rendered in the spiritual body in allegiance to Śrī Rādhā, Lalitā and Rūpa Mañjarī and service in the current physical body must be rendered in allegiance to Vraja-people like Śrī Rūpa and Sanātana. The Bengali translation of the above *śloka* in '**Caitanya Caritāmṛta' (Madhya 22,154-155)** is:

bāhya antara ihāra dui to sādhana; bāhya — sādhaka dehe kore śravaṇa kīrtana
mane — nija siddha deha koriyā bhāvana; rātri dine kore vraje kṛṣṇera sevana

"There are two kinds of devotion in practise — external and internal. In the external practitioner's body devotional practices of hearing and chanting Kṛṣṇa's glories are performed, and internally, in the mentally conceived spiritual body, one renders mental service to Kṛṣṇa in Vraja day and night."

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami's translation is as follows:

bāhya, antara,——ihāra dui ta' sādhana; 'bāhye' sādhaka-dehe kare śravaṇa-kīrtana
'mane' nija-siddha-deha kariyā bhāvana; rātri-dine kare vraje kṛṣṇera sevana

SYNONYMS

bāhya—externally; antara—internally; ihāra—of this spontaneous love of Godhead; dui—two; ta'—indeed; sādhana—such processes of execution; bāhye—externally; sādhaka-dehe—with the body of an advanced devotee; kare—does; śravaṇa-kīrtana—hearing and chanting; mane—the mind; nija—own; siddha-deha—eternal body or self-realized position; kariyā bhāvana—thinking of; rātri-dine—night and day; kare—executes; vraje—in Vṛndāvana; kṛṣṇera—of Lord Kṛṣṇa; sevana—service.

TRANSLATION

"There are two processes by which one may execute this rāgānugā bhakti—external and internal. When self-realized, the advanced devotee externally remains like a neophyte and executes all the śāstric injunctions, especially those concerning hearing and chanting. But within his mind, in his original, purified, self-realized position, he serves Kṛṣṇa in Vṛndāvana in his particular way. He serves Kṛṣṇa twenty-four hours a day, all day and night."

Though the term 'self realised' is a bit too extreme for a description of *sādhana* (this verse appears in the *sādhana bhakti* chapter of Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu), one indeed needs to be fairly advanced to meditate on one's *siddha deha*, as Jīva Gosvāmī has said in Bhakti Sandarbha *smaranaṁ tu śuddhāntaḥkaraṇatām apekṣate* – *Smaranam* requires a pure heart.'

All the elaborations of Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī in Mādhurya Kādambinī on how far up *anarthas* persist (up to the stage of *prema*) are nicely summarised by the Sampradāya's top-*ācārya* Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī in a single verse of his Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu (2.1.276)-

utpanna rataya samyāṅ nairvighnyam anupāgataḥ
kṛṣṇa sākṣāt kṛtau yogyāḥ sa sādhaka parikīrtitaḥ

"Practitioners (*sādhaka*) are those who have developed *rati* for Kṛṣṇa but have not completely extinguished the *anarthas*, and who are qualified to see Kṛṣṇa directly."

Note that he places *nairvighnyam anupāgataḥ* ("not yet free from *anarthas*") in the same definition as *kṛṣṇa sākṣāt-kṛtau yogyaḥ* ("He/she is qualified to see Kṛṣṇa face to face") due to *utpanna rataya* ("His *bhāva bhakti* having arisen"). This verse should not give false hope to pretenders that one is qualified to perceive Kṛṣṇa while still being attached to all kinds of gross indulgence, though - *nairvighnyam anupāgataḥ* obviously refers to subtle *anarthas*. It, on the other hand, also dismisses claims that one is unqualified to meditate, what to speak of realise the spiritual body, while *anarthas* are still there.

15) DOING *BHAJANA* IS NOT SELFISH OR ACTING ONLY FOR ONE'S OWN LIBERATION-

"The word jīva-himsā (envy of other living entities) actually means stopping the preaching of Kṛṣṇa consciousness. Preaching work is described as paropakāra, welfare activity for others. Those who are ignorant of the benefits of devotional service must be educated by preaching. ***If one stops preaching and simply sits down in a solitary place, he is engaging in material activity****." (A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami, Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Madhya 12.135 purport.)*

"There are gosthyanandi and bhajananandi. Bhajananandi is interested for his own welfare, or they think it that he is not competent enough to preach; therefore he does not go for preaching work. ***Sva-vimukti-kama: 'Let me look after my own affairs.' 'Oil your own machine.'*** *So this is another stage, and other stage is a devotee taking all risk, preaching for the benefit of the whole human society. He is called gosthyanandi,increasing the number of devotees.* ***That is preferred by Kṛṣṇa****. It is said in the Bhagavad-gita, ya imam paramam guhyam mad-bhaktesv abhidasyati: 'Anyone who is engaged in preaching this confidential science of Bhagavad-gita, 'na ca tasmad manusyesu kascid me priya-krttamah, 'nobody is dearer to Me than he is.' (A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami, Lecture on S.B.7.9.44, New Delhi, March 26, 1976.)*

Refutation - To understand what is selfish, one first must understand what is the self. Śrīmad Bhāgavata (10.14.55) says: *kṛṣṇam enam avehi tvam ātmānām akhilātmanam*. "Kṛṣṇa is the Self of the selves." The whole preceding story of the kidnapping of Kṛṣṇa's calves and cowherd boyfriends and His expanding Himself into them, and then the mothers and the cows loving their (the Kṛṣṇa-expanded) boys and calves twice as much as their own offspring, is meant to demonstrate this. In other words, *bhajana* is done to please Kṛṣṇa, who is our highest Self, and not to reach personal salvation. In his commentary on Hari bhakti Vilāsa 11.456, Sanātana Gosvāmī says about *saṅkīrtana:* "*saṅkīrtya samyag uccair uccāryeti sadyaḥ sva-parānanda viśeṣārtham uktam* "Loud chanting is at once causing bliss to oneself and to others as well." The Bhāgavata (10.34.17) says: *yan nāma gṛhnann akhilān śroṭṛnn ātmānām eva ca sadyaḥ punāti* "Chanting your name instantly purifies oneself and the audience as well." To think that doing *bhajana* is selfish is superimposing social morality and a material conception of what is the self on absolute surrender to the Objective Absolute. Śrī Kṛṣṇa says, *bhajatāṁ prīti pūrvakam* - "They do My *bhajan* with love" (Bhagavad Gītā 10.10). The verse (Bhāgavata 7.9.44) Swāmījī quotes here speaks about *munis (munaya)* who desire their own liberation (*sva vimukti kāma*) by doing *mauna* (*maunaṁ caranti vijane*) in private. This verse, nor any of the *ācāryas*' commentaries on it, does not speak of *bhajanānandī* Vaiṣṇavas at all.

Caitanya-caritāmṛta Madhya 16.64 –

prati-varṣa nīlācale tumi nā āsibā
gauḍe rahi' mora icchā saphala karibā

SYNONYMS

prati-varṣa--every year; nīlācale--to Jagannātha Purī; tumi--You; nā āsibā- -do not come; gaude rahi'--staying in Bengal; mora icchā--My desire; sa-phala karibā--make successful.

TRANSLATION

"Do not come to Jagannātha Purī every year, but stay in Bengal and fulfill My desire."

Bhaktivedanta purport *– "One who is a faithful servant of Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu must execute His order, even if one has to sacrifice going to Jagannātha Purī to see Lord Jagannātha there. In other words, it is a greater fortune to carry out Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu's order than to* ***satisfy one's senses by seeing Lord Jagannātha.*** *Preaching Caitanya Mahāprabhu's cult throughout the world is more important than staying in*

Vṛndāvana or Jagannātha Purī ***for one's own personal satisfaction****. Spreading Kṛṣṇa consciousness is Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu's mission; therefore His sincere devotees must carry out His desire.*

Refutation – Mahāprabhu did not say in this verse or any other verse that it is sense gratification to see Lord Jagannātha or one stays in the *dhāma* for personal satisfaction. He just said 'Don't come every year to Nilācala. Stay in Bengal and make My desire there a success.'

15b) PREACHING IS NOT A GREATER SERVICE TO KṚṢṆA THAN CONTEMPLATION (*BHAJAN*).

This verse from Bhagavad Gītā is often quoted to prove that preaching is the dearest to Kṛṣṇa:

ya idam paramam guhyam mad-bhakteṣv abhidhāsyati
bhaktim mayi parām kṛtvā mām evaiṣyaty asaṁśayah

SYNONYMS

yah — anyone who; idam — this; **paramam — most; guhyam — confidential secret; mat — of Mine; bhaktesu — amongst devotees;** abhidhāsyati — explains; bhaktim — devotional service; mayi — unto Me; parām — transcendental; krtvā — doing; māṁ — unto Me; eva — certainly; eṣyati — comes; asaṁśayah — without doubt.

TRANSLATION

For one who explains this supreme secret to the devotees, pure devotional service is guaranteed, and at the end he will come back to Me."

Refutation: The verse contains the words *mad bhakteṣu*, proving that this verse describes having Kṛṣṇa-*kathā* amongst the devotees, not disturbing of the minds of the ignorant, which is rejected earlier in the Bhagavad Gītā (3.29, *tan akṛtsno-vido mandan kṛtsnavin na vicālayet),* and which may also become an offence to the chanting of the holy name— *aśraddadhāne vimukhe'pyaśṛṇvati yaś copadeśaḥ śiva nāmāparādha.* Furthermore, the Gītā verse 18.68 mentions the words *paramaṁ guhyaṁ,* which means the greatest secret, pearls that are not to be thrown before swine. Just 3-4 verses earlier, the Gītā does say what **is** actually the highest worship - *sarva guhyatamaṁ bhūya śṛṇu me paramaṁ vacaḥ.* Kṛṣṇa says in Bhagavad Gītā 18.64: "Now listen again to My highest word...." *man manā bhava mad bhakto mad yaji māṁ namaskuru* "Think of Me (*smaraṇa*), be My devotee, worship Me, and bow down to Me." (Bhagavad Gītā 18.65) These are all items of *bhajan*. Kṛṣṇa says about that *mam*

eva eṣyasi - "certainly you will come to Me", *satyam* - "truly" *te pratijāne* - "I promise you that." That is so obvious and strong, and that verse comes two times even in the Bhagavad Gītā (9.34 and 18.65). Most people who do *bhajan* also do some preaching as well anyway, it is rarely purely this way or the other. The context of Bhagavad Gītā verse 18.68 is easily understood by looking back to the preceding verse (18.67) -

idam te nātapaskāya nābhaktāya kadācana
na cāśuśrūsave vācyam na ca mām yo 'bhyasūyati

SYNONYMS

idam — this; te — by you; na — never; atapaskāya — to one who is not austere; na — never; abhaktāya — to one who is not a devotee; kadācana — at any time; na — never; ca — also; aśuśrūsave — to one who is not engaged in devotional service; vācyam — to be spoken; na — never; ca — also; mām — toward Me; yah — anyone who; abhyasūyati — is envious.

TRANSLATION

“This confidential knowledge may never be explained to those who are not austere, or devoted, or engaged in devotional service, nor to one who is envious of Me.”

In Caitanya Caritāmṛta (Madhya 14.13) A.C. Bhaktivedānta Swāmī translates the word *bhūri-da* in Śrīmad Bhāgavata 10.31.9 as “Those who spread the message of Godhead are certainly the most munificent welfare workers."

He tries to establish here that preaching is greater than *bhajan* but the word ‘*bhūri*’ does not mean ‘greatest’ but ‘abundant’ - those who sing Kṛṣṇa’s glories in the world are great donors.

The fact that *bhajan* is higher than preaching makes it also less accessible. In other words, preaching is an easier practise than *bhajan* and therefore it is a more advisable service for the restless and passionate souls of the age of Kali. However, everything is spoiled if one claims to be superior to other Vaiṣṇavas by doing this.

It is also important that, before one starts preaching, one knows and understands Vaiṣṇava philosophy fully and properly, lest one misinforms ignorant and innocent people.

In the transcendental Navadvīpa Dhāma, which is the blueprint of eternal pure *bhakti*, Adwaita Prabhu ran a school, and most *nitya siddha* devotees in Navadvīpa Dhāma were having jobs or businesses. They were not going on book-distribution or even on *harināma* 24/7. Traditionally preaching was not a full-time engagement, not

even in the Gauḍīya Maṭh - it was a benign detour, though some of Mahāprabhu's eternal associates, like Nityānanda Prabhu and Haridās Thakur, and also later *ācāryas* like Narottama, Śrīnivāsa and Śyāmānanda were indeed fulltime preachers.

Preaching is certainly a great service, but still Śrīla Rāmānanda Rāya said to Mahāprabhu:

nija gūḍha kārya tomāra prema āsvādana;
ānusaṅge premodoy koile tribhuvana

(Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Madhya 8)

"Your own confidential activity is to relish *prema* - filling the universe with *prema* is a concomitant act for You."

Tamāl Kṛṣṇa told Prabhupāda that one of the symptoms he has noticed about these people is that they don't go out on sankīrtana. As soon as he said that Śrīla Prabhupāda cut in. "Then everything will be finished. Preaching will be finished. In this sahajiya party, then preaching will be finished." Declaring the siddha-praṇāli process as nonsense, Prabhupāda told us where the whole thing was coming from. "They have learned it from these Rādhā-kuṇḍa bābājīs."

Los Angeles, June, 1976

From this it is clear that the policy of blocking *rāgānugā bhajan* is just meant to serve the preaching organization. Precious manpower would be lost. If devotees starting doing *bhajan*, they would not be productive anymore. It is not a sincere theology.

16) *RĀGĀNUGĀ BHAKTI* DOES NOT HAMPER A PREACHING MISSION

Continuing from the last quote above (Los Angeles, June, 1976):

rāgānugā's value is a matter of attitude, of quality, not of quantity. *vaidhi bhaktas* worship in awe and reverence and *rāgānugā bhaktas* worship in intimate love. *rāgānugā sādhakas* are also preaching worldwide, printing and distributing books and lecturing on Kṛṣṇa consciousness. The outreach practices of preaching, traveling and training disciples can easily go on side by side with *rāgānugā-bhakti sādhana*. No *śāstra* says that each *rāgānugā sādhaka* should life-long chant 8 lakhs (512 rounds) a

day at Rādhākuṇḍa all day. Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.2.5 says that *rāgānugā* is a *sādhana*, simple. There's no link at all between *vairāgya* or huge *sādhanā* and *rāgānugā bhakti*.

VARṆĀŚRAMA-ISSUE

17) WHO IS A *BRĀHMAṆA*?

In Gauḍīya Maṭha and ISKCON we see everyone ultimately receiving *brāhmaṇa*-initiation. But which *varṇāśrama*-society has only *brāhmaṇas*? Qualities and birth are non-different— *kāraṇaṁ guṇa saṅgo'sya sad asad yoni janmasu* (Bhagavad Gītā 13.22). "The cause of birth in either a good or a bad species is one's attachment to a certain psychological quality (culture, habit)." Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu has taught His followers *tṛṇād api sunīcena* "One must consider oneself lower than a blade of grass", not a *mleccha* claiming to be equal to a *brāhmaṇa.* Caste is for life, just as one cannot change one's biological father and mother during this lifetime. A human being can and should not launch one's own *varṇāśrama dharma*, for it is created by God Himself, and He is the highest authority— *catur varṇyaṁ mayā sṛṣṭaṁ* "The four castes are created by Me (God, Kṛṣṇa)", and not by a human being like Bimal Prasād Datta, the original founder of the various Gauḍīya Missions that preach in the west, however elevated he may have been. In Śrīmad Bhāgavata (7.15.14) human concoctions about *varṇāśrama dharma* are called *ābhāsa dharma,* or facade-religion – *yas tvicchayā kṛtaḥ pumbhir ābhāso hyāśramāt pṛthak:* "That which has been created by man according to their own whim, separately from the established *āśramas*, is called *abhāsa."* Finding fault in a *brāhmaṇa* or trying to usurp his position will cost you dear, for Śrī Kṛṣṇa Himself says in the Bhāgavata (10.64.41-42):

vipraṁ kṛtāgasam api naiva druhyata māmakāḥ
ghnantaṁ bahu śapantaḥ vā namaskuruta nityaśaḥ
yathāhaṁ praṇame viprān anukūlaṁ samāhitaṁ
tathā namata yūyaṁ ca ye'nyathā me sa daṇḍa-bhāk

"O My relatives! Do not harm a *brāhmaṇa*, even if he mistreats you! Even if he is a sinner, abuses you or abundantly curses you, you should always bow down to him. Even I bow down to the *brāhmaṇas*. Whoever acts otherwise is punishable by

Me!" The best example is Indra, who had to suffer severely for killing the *brāhmaṇa* Vṛtrāsura, even though he was a demon.

If the river Gangā is considered pure in spite of all dirt, if Go is considered worshipable and inviolable even if it comes to kill, the *brāhmaṇa* must also be considered worshipable right from birth despite his faults. Just like *gotva,* it is the *brāhmaṇatva* which is glorified. This *brāhmaṇatva* is by birth, just as the *gotva* of the cow is by birth.

The Lord further tells Śrutadeva in Śrīmad Bhāgavata (10.86.53):

brāhmaṇo janmanā śreyān sarveṣāṁ prāṇināṁ iha
tapasā vidyayā tuṣṭyā kim u mat kalayā yutaḥ

The *brāhmaṇa* is superior to all living beings **by birth.** Let alone when he is austere, learned, content and devoted to Me."

In his commentary to verse 53, Śrī Sanātana Gosvāmī says: *janmanā jāti mātreṇa – "janmanā* means, just by jāti, caste."

Nanda Mahārāja told Garga Muni:

tvaṁ hi brahma-vidāṁ śreṣṭhaḥ saṁskārān kartum arhasi
bālayor anayor nṛṇāṁ janmanā brāhmaṇo guruḥ

(Śrīmad Bhāgavata 10.8.6)

"You are the greatest knower of the Vedas, so you are qualified to perform this rite on my sons. A brāhmaṇa is Guru by birth."

Jīva Goswāmī Vaiṣṇava *toṣaṇī ṭīkā–janmanā jātyeva kiṁ punar jñānādinetyarthaḥ* - He is Guru by caste, what to speak of by knowledge and so?

Jīva Goswāmī Bṛhad Vaiṣṇava Toṣanī – *janmanā janma mātreṇaiva kiṁ punar jñānādinetyarthaḥ "janmanā* means only by birth, what to speak of knowledge and so?"

Jīva Goswāmī Krama Sandarbha – *janmanā jātyeva* "By birth means by caste only."

duṣprajñā aviditvaivam avajanānantyasūyavaḥ; guruṁ māṁ vipram ātmānam

"Men of crooked understanding, who do not know this, disrespect a *brāhmaṇa* and are envious of him, who is identical with Me and their very self." (Ś.B. 10.86.55)

The Bhāgavata (7.11.13) declares that a *brāhmaṇa* must first be born in a family that has always, throughout the generations, followed all the *saṁskāras* for the *brāhmaṇas*—

saṁskārā yad avichinnāḥ sa dvijo'jo jagāda yam

"A twice born *brāhmaṇa* is he in whose family the (16) purificatory rites have been performed in unbroken succession and whom Lord Brahmā has denominated as such." Śrīpāda Śrīdhara Svāmī comments on this verse:

śūdraṁ tu na mantravat saṁskāra yuktaṁ jagāda na copanayanavantam ato nāsau dvijaḥ....ato vivāha vyatirikta saṁskārānavaśyakatvāt upanayanasya tu sarvathā niṣedhāt na tasya dvijatvam

"The *śūdra* is not to be invested with *mantras* nor with the sacred thread, hence he is not a *dvija."* "Other than marriage there is no *saṁskāra* for the *śūdra,* therefore the sacred thread ceremony is forbidden for him in all respects and he cannot be a *dvija."* What to speak then of a *mleccha?*

Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartīpāda comments on this verse:

saṁskāra mantravanto garbhādhānādayo yasmin sa dvijaḥ. vichinna saṁskāro dvijabandhur ityarthaḥ. ajo brahmā yaṁ jagādeti brahma sṛṣṭyārambhata eva pravṛttāyāṁ dvija jātau viśuddha mātā pitṛkaṁ janmaiva mukhya lakṣaṇam

"A *dvija* is a person whose parents have gone through purificatory rites like the *garbhādhāna saṁskāra.* When there is no unbroken succession of *saṁskāras* the *brāhmaṇa* is called *dvija bandhu*. This practise is going on since the creation by the unborn Brahmā. The main symptom of the twice-born caste is merely birth from a pure father and mother."

Śrīdhara Svāmī comments on Śrīmad Bhāgavata 7.11.35: *śamādibhir eva brāhmaṇādi vyavahāro mukhyaḥ na jāti mātrād ityāha yasyeti. yad yadi anyatra varṇāntare'pi tad varṇāntaraṁ tenaiva lakṣaṇa nimittenaiva varṇena vinirdiśet na tu jāti nimittenetyarthaḥ* - "One is not just a *brāhmaṇa* by birth, the main symptom is good behaviour like self-control. If such virtue is found elsewhere, in another caste, this determines the person's *varṇa,* not just birth." However, Śrīdhara Svāmī does not say in this text that non-*brāhmaṇas* can receive the sacred thread. If he did, then he would contradict his commentary of verse 13.

This verse from the Mahābhārata (Anuśāśana Parva chapter 163) is often quoted –

na yonir nāpi saṁskāro na śrutam na ca santatiḥ
kāraṇāni dvijatvasya vṛttaṁ eva tu kāraṇam

"Neither birth, purificatory ceremonies, nor learning, nor progeny, but one's mode of life alone is the cause for *dvijatva*."

The meaning of this is that, if a *brāhmaṇa* leads his whole life in a manner that is not conforming to how a *brāhmaṇa* must live (as per *śāstras*), in his next life, he will attain that mode in which he led his life. In the same mode often the Vajra Sucika Upaniṣad is quoted, but this Upaniṣad says nothing about giving *brāhmaṇa*-threads to *mlecchas* or *śūdras*, nor does it say that one should not be first born a *brāhmaṇa* to be considered qualified.

This knowledge should not be alien to the followers of Śrīpād Bhaktisiddhānta, for his own father Bhaktivinoda explains in his Jaiva Dharma (Chapter 6):

"Cuḍāmaṇi: “One must take birth in a *brāhmaṇa*-family to perform *yajñas* and other such activities, and even one who is born in a *brāhmaṇa*-family must be purified by the ceremony of investiture with the sacred thread before he is eligible to perform the duties of a *brāhmaṇa*. Similarly, a *caṇḍāla* may have become purified by the chanting of *harināma*, but he is still not eligible to perform *yajñas* until he acquires a seminal birth in a *brāhmaṇa*-family. However, he can perform the limbs of *bhakti* which are infinitely greater than *yajñas*."

Cuḍāmani: “What kind of conclusion is that? That a person not qualified for an ordinary thing can be qualified for an exalted thing! What is the clear proof for that?

Vaiṣṇava dāsa: "There are two types of human activity: material activities that relate to practical existence (*vyavahārika*); and spiritual activities that relate to the ultimate truth (*pāramārthika*). A person may have attained spiritual qualification, but that does not necessarily qualify him for particular material activities. For example, one who is a Muslim by birth may have acquired the nature and all the qualities of a *brāhmaṇa*, so that he is a *brāhmaṇa* from the spiritual point of view, but he still remains ineligible for certain material activities, such as marrying the daughter of a *brāhmaṇa*.”

Cuḍāmaṇi: “Why not? What is wrong with that?”

Vaiṣṇava dāsa: “If one violates social customs, one is guilty of secular impropriety, and members of society who take pride in their social respectability do not condone such activities. That is why one should not perform them, even if he is spiritually qualified.”

Q.: There are numerous non-*brāhmaṇas* who became *brāhmaṇas* in the same life. If *brāhmaṇatva* is by birth then how did they become *brāhmaṇas*?

A: It is true that there were non-*brāhmaṇas* who became *brāhmaṇas* in the same life, but these were exceptions, not the rule. The scriptures themselves question these exceptions and answer them. A few examples:

Mahābhārata, Anuśāśana parva (3.1-2) -

brāhmaṇyaṁ yadi duṣprāpaṁ tribhir varṇair narādhipa
kathaṁ prāptaṁ mahārāja kṣatriyeṇa mahātmanā
viśvāmitreṇa dharmātman brāhmaṇatvaṁ nararṣabha
śrotum icchāmi tattvena tan me brūhi pitāmaha

'If, O prince, *brāhmaṇa*-hood is so hard to attain by the three classes (Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and śūdras), how then did the high souled Viśvāmitra, though a Kṣatriya (by birth), attain the status of a Brāhmaṇa? I desire to know this, O sire. Therefore, relate this matter to me in truth please.”

The description continues wherein, sage Ṛcīka, a son of sage Bhṛgu married Satyavatī, a princess. Please with her nature, he blessed her that she will have a brāhmaṇa-son. Satyavatī's mother, wife of King Gādhi also wanted a child. On Satyavatī's request, sage Ṛcīka gave both of them 2 *carus (pāyasa)* along with instructions to embrace two different trees. The mother and daughter exchanged their *carus* and the trees. Hearing this, sage Ṛcīka explained that he had infused the potency of an effulgent *brāhmaṇa* in the *caru* meant for Satyavatī and that of a fiery *kṣatriya* in the *caru* meant for her mother. But since they exchanged the *carus* and also embraced the trees meant for the other, Satyavatī would give birth to a fiery *kṣatriya*, though a *brāhmaṇa* by birth and her mother an effulgent *brāhmaṇa*, though a *kṣatriya* by birth. On account of Satyavatī's pleas, he agreed to make her grandson instead of

son with the nature of a fiery *kṣatriya*. The grandson was Paraśurāma. The *kṣatriya* who was actually a *brāhmaṇa* was Viśvāmitra. Thus Viśvāmitra became a *brāhmaṇa* because of the grace of sage Ṛcīka. In chapters 28 and 29 of Anuśāśana parva, it is explained through the story of Mathanga that it is not possible to become a *brāhmaṇa* even through the fiercest of penances.

Śrī Raghunātha Dāsa Gosvāmi writes in his Śrī Manaḥ śikṣā:

gurau goṣṭhe goṣṭhālayiṣu sujane bhū-sura-gaṇe
sva-mantre śrī-nāmni vraja-nava-yuva-dvandva-smaraṇe
sadā dambhaṁ hitvā kuru ratim apūrvām atitarāṁ
aye svāntar bhrātaś caṭubhir abhiyāce dhṛta-padaḥ ||1||

"O mind, I grasp your feet and beg you with sweet words: please cast away hypocrisy at all times and have unprecedented love for my Guru, Vrajabhūmi, the people of Vraja, the Vaiṣṇavas, the *brāhmaṇas*, the *mantras* given by my Guru, the holy name and the fresh young couple of Vraja."

Here he uses two words, *sujana* (vaiṣṇavas) and *bhū-sura-gaṇa (brāhmaṇas)*. If Vaiṣṇavas are automatically *brāhmaṇas* in every respect, then there is no need to give two categories. Giving two categories means each is unique and yet both have something in common. If a *brāhmaṇa* is to be worshipped only if he is a Vaiṣṇava, then there is no need to specifically mention *brāhmaṇa* and Vaiṣṇava.

In the **Haribhakti Vilāsa (1:34, 47, 51 and 52,** paragraphs *gurūpasatti* and *viśeṣataḥ śrī guror lakṣaṇāni*), Śrīla Sanātana Gosvāmī and Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī state that the first choice of a qualified *guru* should be a born *brāhmaṇa* — *vipraṁ pradhvasta kāma* (1.34) *brāhmaṇaḥ sarvakālajña* (1.47). *varṇottame'tha ca gurau* (1.51) If a qualified *brāhmaṇa* cannot be found, a qualified *kṣatriya* must be sought, etc. Furthermore, these verses of Haribhakti Vilāsa say that one should not give *pratiloma dīkṣā,* viz. a low caste Guru giving *dīkṣā* to a high caste disciple — *prātilomyaṁ na dīkṣayet* (1.52). Śrīla Narottama Dās ṭhākura was an exceptional case - he gave *dīkṣā* to high caste persons, but at the end he rose from the dead and his body melted like milk into the Gaṅgā. Let low caste or outcaste Gurus first perform such *siddha*

miracles before they imitate *mahājana* Narottama's pastimes of giving *dīkṣā* to *brāhmaṇas.*

Śrīmad Bhāgavata (3.33.6):

yan-nāmadheya-śravaṇānukīrtanād
yat-prahvaṇād yat-smaraṇād api kvacit
śvādo 'pi sadyaḥ savanāya kalpate
kutaḥ punas te bhagavan nu darśanāt

"O Lord, what to speak of those who see You face to face, even a person born in a family of dog-eaters immediately becomes eligible to perform Vedic sacrifices if he occasionally utters the Lord's holy name, chants about Him, hears about His glories, bows down to Him or remembers Him."

Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī comments on Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.1.22, which is Śrī Rūpa Gosvāmī's comment on its twin verse:

tasmād durjātir evety atra savanāyogyatve'pi kāraṇam iti tad-yogyatā pratikūla-pāpamayīty arthaḥ. na tu tad-yogyatvābhāva-mātra-mayīti. brāhmaṇāṇāṁ śaukre janmani durjātitvābhāve'pi savana-yogyatvāya puṇya-viśeṣa-maya-sāvitra-janmāpekṣatvāt. tataśca savana-yogyatva-pratikūla-durjāty-ārambhakaṁ prārabdham api gatam eva kintu śiṣṭācārābhāvāt sāvitraṁ janma nāstīti brāhmaṇa-kumārāṇāṁ savana-yogyatvābhāvāvacchedaka-puṇya-viśeṣa-maya-sāvitra-janmāpekṣāvad asya janmāntarāpekṣā vartata iti bhāvaḥ. ataḥ pramāṇa-vākye'pi savanāya kalpate sambhāvito bhavati na tu tadaivādhikārī syād ity abhipretam.

"Therefore bad birth itself is here the cause of being unqualified for Soma-sacrifice and that means possessing sin that is antagonistic to qualification for that, not merely having an absence of qualification for that. Even though there is an absence of bad birth in being born from the seed of *brāhmaṇas* there is still the necessity for a *sūrya*-birth (i.e. sacred thread initiation) which possesses the merit suitable for qualifying one for Soma-sacrifice. Therefore though the *prārabdha* that caused the bad birth that is antagonistic to suitability for soma sacrifice is gone, like *brāhmaṇa*-boys who because of absence of cultured practice have no *sūrya*-birth and must await a *sūrya*-birth that possesses the merit that can cut to pieces their absence of suitabilty for Soma-sacrifice, he (the dog-eater who has heard the names of Kṛṣṇa) must await another birth. This is the position. Therefore, in the statement of authority (the Bhāgavata, 3.33.6) the words *savanāya kalpate*, "he becomes fit for

soma sacrifice," are intended to mean he becomes respected or honored (as if he were qualified for Soma-sacrifice), but not that he has actually become qualified then and there."

Śrīdhara Svāmī comments on Śrīmad Bhāgavata 3.33.6: *anena pūjyatvaṁ lakṣyate* – "This verse just describes how the chanting dogeater is worshipable."

Śrī Jīva comments on this verse and Śrīdhara Swāmī's comment in Bhakti Sandarbha (128): *tasmāt pūjyatva mātra tātparyam ityabhipretya ṭīkā-kṛdbhir apy uktam anena pūjyatvaṁ lakṣyata iti* – "The only purpose of Śrīdhara Swāmī's commentary on this verse is to show how the chanting dog-eater is worshipable (not that he literally becomes a Brahmin)."

Śrī Sanātana Gosvāmī repeats that point in his Dig-darśini ṭīkā to Hari bhakti vilāsa:

brāhmaṇa-kumārāṇāṁ śaukre janmani yogyatve saty api sāvitra-daikṣya-janmāpekṣāvat. sāvitrādi-janmani tu sad-ācāra-prāpter iti savane pravṛttir na yujyate. tasmāt pūjyatva-mātre tātparyam ity abhipretya ṭīkā-kṛdbhir apy uktam anena pūjyatvaṁ lakṣyata iti

"Just as even though there is the eligibility in the son of a brāhmaṇa through seminal birth, there is still the dependence on the birth through *sāvitra-dīkṣā* (initiation into *gāyatrī mantra),* birth through *sāvitra-dīkṣa* is but attained through *sad-ācāra* and thus, performing *soma yāga* is not suitable. Therefore, the purport here is only *pūjyatva* (being worshipable) and thus the commentator (Śrīdhara Svāmī) too has said *"anena pūjyatvam lakṣyata*".

In his Bhāgavata *ṭīkā* named Krama Sandarbha Jīva Gosvāmī says:

tatra yogyatāyāṁ labdhārambho bhavatīty arthaḥ. tad-anantara-janmany eva dvijatvaṁ prāpya tad-ādy-adhikārī syād –

„It just means that there is a beginning made with qualification – he only becomes really qualified by taking a brahmin birth in the next life."

From this huge amount of authorised evidence it must be clear that the phrase *guṇa karma vibhāgaśaḥ,* "divided according to quality and activity", which is quoted by Śrīpād Bhaktisiddhānta's followers from Bhagavad-Gītā 4.12 to prove that mere qualification at this very instant is enough to qualify as a *brāhmaṇa*, refers to previous births' accumulation of a certain attitude (*guṇa*) and activities (*karma*) that cause one to take birth in a certain caste in the present life. Many westerners, who are not

acquainted with Vedic culture, think that this idea of '*brāhmaṇa* by quality alone' has always been the Vedic norm, but, in his **comment on Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 8.128,** A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami himself confirms that it was introduced by Bhaktisiddhānta Saraswati:

"Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura therefore introduced the sacred thread ceremony for all Vaiṣṇavas according to the rules and regulations."

Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa comments on Bhagavad Gita 18.41 that *svabhāva*, or nature, is formed by impressions from previous births - *svabhāvaḥ prāktana-saṁskāras*. You cannot reform the laws of *karma*, nature and subsequent reincarnation.

Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartīpāda has elaborated further on this point to some degree, stating that since such sacrificial activities are lower on the spiritual hierarchy than direct service to Kṛṣṇa, they are not to be taken up even by Brāhmaṇa Vaiṣṇavas. **Sanātana Gosvāmī** says in **Bṛhad Bhāgavatāmṛta** (2.2.57):

eṣāṁ yajñaika niṣṭhānām aikyenāvaśyake nije
jape ca sad gurūddiṣṭe māndyaṁ syād dṛṣṭa sat phale

"Mahārṣis offered Gopa Kumāra the status of a *brāhmaṇa,* but he thought to himself: "If I accept the position of a *brāhmaṇa*, I will surely slacken in my practise of the *mantra* that I received from the bonafide *guru*, and that is certainly not good. *brāhmaṇas* are only engaged in *yajñas* and are not engaged in other matters."

18) SECOND INITIATION OR *MANTRA*-INITIATION IS NOT *BRĀHMAṆA* INITIATION

The *brāhmaṇa*-thread is only for practising the Brahma Gāyatrī, not for the Vaiṣṇava-*dīkṣā-mantras* like Gopāla *mantra* and Kāma Gāyatrī. Only the last two are mentioned in Hari Bhakti Vilāsa as Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava *dīkṣā-mantras.* Proof that *brāhmaṇa* initiation and *mantra* initiation are two different things is shown in Hari Bhakti Vilāsa (2.3-4):

dvijānāṁ anupetānāṁ sva-karmādhyayanādiṣu
yathādhikāro nāstīha syāccopanayanād anu

tathātrādīkṣitānāṁ tu mantra devārcanādiṣu
nādhikāro'styataḥ kuryād ātmānaṁ śiva saṁstutam

A.C. Bhaktivedānta Swāmī quotes this verse in his commentary on Caitanya Caritamrita (Madhya 15.108) and translates it as follows:

"Even though born in a brāhmaṇa family, one cannot engage in Vedic rituals without being initiated and having a sacred thread. Although born in a brāhmaṇa family, one becomes a brāhmaṇa after initiation and the sacred thread ceremony. Unless one is initiated as a brāhmaṇa, he cannot worship the holy name properly."

This is, however, not a correct translation. The proper translation is:

"Just as an *anupanita vipra* (born *brāhmaṇa* who is not yet initiated with the *brāhmaṇa* thread) does not yet qualify to study the Vedas, but does so after getting the *upanayana* (sacred thread) *saṁskāra*, similarly an uninitiated person does not qualify for the Lord's *arcana* (temple worship). Hence one should take *dīkṣā* (*śiva saṁstutam iti dīkṣitam*)."

Noteworthy are the words *tathā* (also) and *atra* (here), 'here' meaning "in practise of arcana", showing that this verse is a comparison between *brāhmaṇa*-hood on the one hand and Vaiṣṇava-*dīkṣā* on the other, and that these are two separate things, not one and the same as in the Gauḍīya Maṭh and ISKCON.

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami comments on Śrīmad Bhāgavat 4.31.10:

By chanting the Hare Kṛṣṇa mahā-mantra regularly and following the regulative principles, one becomes qualified to be initiated as a brāhmaṇa, because unless one is a qualified brahmana he cannot be allowed to worship Lord Viṣṇu.

Refutation: Śrīmad Bhāgavat 10.27.4 –
etad vai sarva-varṇānām āśramāṇāṁ ca sammatam
śreyasām uttamaṁ manye strī-śūdrāṇāṁ ca mānada

BBT Translation -

"This process is accepted by and appropriate for all the occupational and spiritual orders of society. Therefore I consider worship of You in Your Deity form to be the most beneficial of all spiritual practices, **even for women and *śūdras***."

A *brāhmaṇa* is called *dvija,* or twice born. How can you have the second birth (*upanayaṇa saṁskāra*) without having had the first one (*śaukra* or seminal birth)? *brahma gāyatri* investment is done by the father of a *brāhmaṇa*-boy when he is 11 years old. The boy should not see the sun for many days (since the *brāhma gāyatrī* is a solar *mantra*) and is locked up into a room with the windows shut, given only *haviṣyānna* (porridge without salt, spices or sugar) to eat. Initiation into Kṛṣṇa-*mantra* is a separate initiation which is only given to active Vaiṣṇava-*brāhmaṇas*. This is called the *brāhmaṇa's* third birth (*daikṣa janma*). For instance, Mahāprabhu already wore His thread when He received *kṛṣṇa mantra* from Īśvara Puri and Advaita Prabhu had been doing *brahma gāyatrī* for decades when He received Kṛṣṇa-*mantra* from Mādhavendra Puri. And what if the 'qualified' *brāhmaṇa* falls down and starts drinking and illicit sex (which happens in almost all cases in western branches of Iskcon and Gauḍīya Maṭha)? Then we take his *sutra* away and give it back to him as soon as he follows the principles again? Isn't this bizarre? Has this ever been shown in any Vedic scripture? We are seeing in Iskcon the highest divorce rate in the world, their women have children from different men, in India even the sweepers' wives don't do that, 'qualified brāhmaṇas' keep dogs in their houses – even the sweepers in India don't do that – where is the qualification then?

Considering the *dvijatva* in the Haribhakti Vilāsa-verse, that says

yathā kāñcanatāṁ yāti kāṁsyaḥ rasa vidhānataḥ
tathā dīkṣā vidhānena dvijatvaṁ jāyate nṛṇāṁ

"As bell metal is turned into gold through the process of alchemy, similarly a human being attains twice born status through the process of *dīkṣā"*

In his commentary Sanātana Gosvāmī confirms that *dvijatva* means *vipratā* for everyone *(sarveṣām eva dvijatva vipratā)*, and thus Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī seems justified in turning everyone into a *brāhmaṇa*. However,

1. This does not mention the *brahma gāyatrī*, this statement deals with Vaiṣṇava *dīkṣā*.

2. If this referred to *brahma gāyatrī*, then that would contradict Śrīdhara Svāmī's and Jīva Gosvāmī's verdict that this is not attainable for non-*brāhmaṇas* in their current births.

3. In his **Bhakti Sandarbha** (298) Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī has quoted this verse under the heading *athārcanādhikāri nirṇayaḥ* - 'Now follows the designation of eligibility for deity worship." Then he proceeds by quoting scripture on the eligibility of all castes and genders for deity worship, ending with *yathā kāñcanatāṁ*. This is the context in which this verse appears.

4. None of Mahāprabhu's *nitya siddha* associates, like Advaita or Nityānanda, Gadādhara, Śrīnivāsācārya, Narottama, Śyāmānanda, nor any of Their disciples or granddisciples have ever put such a '*brāhmaṇa*-initiation' into practise, nor have any of them ever involved the Brāhma Gāyatrī in the process. *mahājano yena gata sa pantha* — One must follow in the footsteps of the *mahājanas*. Before 1918, 350 years after the compilation of Haribhakti Vilāsa, no one has ever given *'brāhmaṇa*-initiation'. Shall we assume that Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī knew it better than the Pañca Tattva, the Six Gosvāmīs, and all their successor *ācāryas*?

5. In **Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu** (1.2.62) Rūpa Gosvāmī quotes the Kāśī-khaṇḍa —

antyajā api tad-rāṣṭre śaṅkha-cakrāṅka-dhāriṇaḥ
*samprāpya vaiṣṇavīṁ dīkṣāṁ dīkṣitā **iva** sambabhuḥ*

"In that country even the outcastes wore conch and disc signs. They received Vaiṣṇava *dīkṣā* and thus becames **just like** sacrificial priests."

Viśvanātha Cakravartī comments**:** *dīkṣitā yājükā **iva** sambabhuḥ* - "*dīkṣitā* means just like sacrificial priests." *iva* means 'just like', not that they actually became sacrificial priests.

6. If the Haribhakti Vilāsa-verse *yathā kāncanatāṁ yāti* was really about giving *brāhmaṇa*-threads to all the *mlecchas*, why was this verse not followed by a description of how such a ceremony is to be held?

Śrīmad Bhāgavata 1.7.43 –

uvāca cāsahanty asyabandhanānayanaṁ satī
mucyatāṁ mucyatām eṣa brāhmaṇo nitarāṁ guruḥ

“Draupadi could not tolerate Aśvatthāmā's being bound by ropes, and being a devoted lady, she said: Release him, for he is a *brāhmaṇa*, our spiritual master.”

The text *brāhmaṇo nitarāṁ guruḥ* actually means ‘*brāhmaṇas* are always Guru’. This clearly shows that Aśvatthāmā was still referred to as a *brāhmaṇa* despite his heinous act. He did not get demoted to a śūdra or less because of his sinful behavior. Even a *dvija-bandhu* must be treated differently from others even if he commits the most grievous sins and is an *ātatāyī;* he must never be killed - *śrī-bhagavān uvāca—brahma-bandhur na hantavya*. The Lord said: “One should not kill a fallen brāhmaṇa.” (Śrīmad Bhāgavata 1.7.53) Thus respect shown to *brāhmaṇas* is real and a must.

Droṇa: He was a *brāhmaṇa* but took to the life of a *kṣatriya* due to his warlike disposition. Was he then referred to thereafter as a *kṣatriya*? No. Anyone who has read the Mahābhārata can tell you that the text continued to refer to him as a *brāhmaṇa*.

Arjuna: He demonstrated a propensity towards renunciation when he declined to fight on the battlefield of Kurukṣetra. He was ready to renounce everything and just live by begging. Did Lord Kṛṣṇa accept it? No. He argued that Arjuna was a *kṣatriya* and should fight the battle despite his brāhmiṇical disposition.

These examples refute the point of view that one's varṇa changes on the basis of his "mentality." Finally, let us quote other śāstric evidence that further refutes this point of view:

Bhagavad-gītā As It Is 18.47-

śreyān sva-dharmo viguṇaḥ para-dharmāt sv-anuṣṭhitāt
svabhāva-niyataṁ karma kurvan nāpnoti kilbiṣam

“It is better to engage in one's own occupation, even though one may perform it imperfectly, than to accept another's occupation and perform it perfectly. Duties prescribed according to one's nature are never affected by sinful reactions.”

Bhagavad-gītā As It Is 18.59

yad ahaṅkāram āśritya na yotsya iti manyase
mithyaiṣa vyavasāyas te prakṛtis tvāṁ niyokṣyati

"If you do not act according to My direction and do not fight, then you will be falsely directed. By your nature, you will have to be engaged in warfare."

Why did Lord Kṛṣṇa say it was Arjuna's nature to fight? And that too despite Arjuna offering to give up everything and take to begging? Because Arjuna was born a *kṣatriya* and he was obligated to follow *kṣatriya dharma.* Arjuna did not get promoted to *brāhmaṇa*-status because of his compassion for his family.

Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa's commentary to 18.47:

nanu kṣatriyādi-dharmānāṁ rājasāditvāt teṣu ruci-śūnyaiḥ kṣatriyādibhiḥ sāttviko brahma-dharma evānuṣṭheya iti cet tatrāha śreyān iti. sva-dharmo viguṇaḥ nikṛṣṭo'pi samyag-anuṣṭhito'pi vā para-dharmād utkṛṣṭāt svanuṣṭhitāc ca śreyān atipraśaṣṭo vihitatvāt.

"If it is said by someone that, only *sāttvika brāhmaṇa dharma* must be conducted by those *kṣatriyas* that have no taste for the *dharmas* of *kṣatriyas* and others because of their being in *rajas,* it is said, *śreyān svadharmo-viguṇaḥ* – it is better to practice one's own *dharma* imperfectly than another's *dharma* perfectly…."

Someone may argue:

janmanā jāyate śūdraḥ saṁskārāt bhaveddvijaḥ
veda-paṭhād bhaved vipraḥ brahmajānātīti brāhmaṇaḥ.

"The meaning of who is a *brāhmaṇa* is very clear - one who knows *brahman.* Hence, all scriptural statements that apply to a *brāhmaṇa* can only apply to one who has realised *brahman* and is completely free of faults such as *kāma, krodha* etc and does not depend on considerations of one's birth."

Refutation: The scriptural statements applicable to a *brāhmaṇa* apply only to that person who has directly realised *brahman* and is completely devoid of *kāma,*

krodha, lobha etc. Then, when it comes to practicality the following points are to be considered:

a) Those who directly experience brahman and are free from all six faults are very, very rare. One in a million. So what happens to all the injunctions in the *śāstras* meant for *brāhmaṇas*? Are they to be done by anyone at all or wait only for those extremely rare personalities to do whenever they become qualified by realising brahman? If they are not done by the millions of so called *brāhmaṇas* citing disqualification, it then leads to destruction of *dharma*. A result which will be contrary to the purpose of those injunctions.

b) Once one becomes a true *brāhmaṇa*, what interest does he have in performing the activities in the *śāstras* for all of them are *laukika* and he will have no *laukika śraddhā*, having directly realised brahman? He practically is a non-starter and these activities will never be performed by anyone at all. If he can do it only after he attains such realisation, it is known that such realisation comes by years of *sādhana*? What activities does he do till he gets such realisation? Anything that he pleases or his *svadharma*? If he does anything that he pleases, there are numerous statements in all scriptures including *bhakti-śāstras* that stand against him. Thus he must only follow his *svadharma* according to his birth.

This verse seems to be from the Smṛtis. (So far no source reference was given) If the meaning is taken literally as "by birth one is born a *śūdra*" and is taken to apply to every human being born on earth, then this contradicts numerous other statements which mention about a *brāhmaṇa* that he is a *brāhmaṇa* right from birth.

Giving a '*brāhmaṇa*-thread is meant to give respect to aspirants and flatter them into becoming your follower. It does not change the quality of your semen into *brāhmaṇa*-semen.

19) THERE HAS NEVER BEEN A PROHIBITION BY THE VAIṢṆAVA ĀCĀRYAS OR THE SCRIPTURES TO CALL HOUSEHOLDER-*ĀCĀRYAS* 'GOSVĀMĪ'.

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami on Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Ādi 12.27-

One who is still in family life should not misuse the title gosvāmī. *Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura did not recognize the caste gosvāmīs because they were not in the line of the six gosvāmīs in the renounced order who were direct disciples of Lord Caitanya Mahāprabhu—namely Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī, Śrīla Sanātana Gosvāmī, Śrīla*

Bhaṭṭa Raghunātha Gosvāmī, Śrī Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī and Śrīla Raghunātha dāsa Gosvāmī. Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura said that the gṛhastha āśrama, or the status of family life, is a sort of concession for sense gratification. ***Therefore a gṛhastha should not falsely adopt the title gosvāmī.*** *The ISKCON movement has never conferred the title gosvāmī upon a householder.*

Refutation: Śrī Narottama Ṭhākura Mahāśaya sang: *doyā koro sītāpati, advaita gosāi,* addressing the householder Guru Advaita Prabhu with *gosāi.* Advaita is also repeatedly called *gosvāmī* in Kavi Karṇapūra's 'Caitanya Candrodaya Nāṭakam'. To see the ‘caste-‘ Gosvāmīs as different from the Lords - Nityānanda and Advaita - that they directly descend from in family line is an offence to Nityānanda and Advaita, for the Vedas teach us *ātmā vai jāyate putraḥ* — "So father, so son", or: "The child is the image of the father." (Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Madhya 12.56) Lord Balarāma said in Śrīmad Bhāgavata (10.78.36):

ātma vai putra utpanna iti vedānuśāsanam; tasmād asya bhaved vaktā

“O worshipable sages, the Vedas declare that one’s own self is reborn as the son, therefore let Romaharṣaṇa’s son recite the Purāṇas to you!”

pituḥ putro yena jāta sa eva saḥ (Ś.B. 9.20.21):

“The son belongs to the father. Indeed, the son **is** the father.”

The Bhāgavata teaches respect for Guru-families as well, as in this statement by Draupadī (Śrīmad Bhāgavata 1.7.46)-

tad dharmajña mahābhāga bhavadbhir gauravaṁ kulam
vṛjinaṁ nārhati prāptuṁ pūjyaṁ vandyam abhīkṣṇaśaḥ

“O knower of *dharma*! You should not cause suffering to the family of your *guru*, because they are always praiseworthy and worthy of worship.”

Śrīdhara Swāmī and Viśvanātha Cakravartī both gloss *gaurava* as *guroḥ kulam*, the family of the Guru.

Staying with family-succession, there is no question that one can/should not be initiated by one's parents: Hemalatā Ṭhākurāṇī, *guru* of Yadunandana Ṭhākura, took

initiation from her father Śrīnivāsācārya, Kṛṣṇa Miśra took initiation from his mother Sītā-devī and Vīrabhadra Prabhu took initiation from his co-mother Jāhnavā Devī. Vīrabhadra was a son of Nityānanda Prabhu, but according to 'Advaita Prakāśa' he went to Advaita Prabhu for *dīkṣā.* Advaita Prabhu sent him back to his own family to take *dīkṣā* there, which confirms that it was the wish of Nityānanda and Advaita Prabhu that these family-*guru paramparās* would be created.
Sanātan Gosvāmī gave *dīkṣā* to his brother Rūpa Gosvāmī and Rupa Gosvāmī gave *dīkṣā* to his nephew Jīva Gosvāmī
Prabodhānanda gave *dīkṣā* to his nephew Gopāl bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī
Vīrabhadra gave *dīkṣā* to his father-in-law and his three sons
Śrīnivāsācārya gave *dīkṣā* to his two wives, three sons and three daughters.
Kṛṣṇacaran Cakravartī gave *dīkṣā* to Rādhāraman Cakravartī (Viśvanātha Cakravartī's Guru)
Gati Govinda, Śrīnivāsācārya's son, gave *dīkṣā* to his son who gave *dīkṣā* to his son.
Kavi Karṇapura was already told to chant by Mahāprabhu, after which he took *dīkṣā* from Śrīnātha Cakravartī, the *kula-guru* of his father and grandfather.
Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa took *dīkṣā* from *kula-guru* Rādhā-Dāmodar Gosvāmī.

ISKCON/Gauḍīya Maṭha preachers attract followers from family *gurus* ('caste Gosvāmīs') by pointing at Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī's Bhakti Sandarbha (210) *tad etat paramārtha gurvāśrayo vyavahārika gurvādi parityāgenāpi kartavyam* "One should give up a mundane *guru* and take a spiritual *guru",* but this 'mundane *guru'* refers to a marriage-priest, village elder or parent, not necessarily to a family *guru,* for in **Haribhakti Vilāsa (4.363)** the Brahma Vaivarta Purāṇa is quoted:

upadeṣṭāram āmnāyāgataṁ pariharanti ye;
tān mṛtān api kravyādāḥ kṛtaghnān nopabhuñjate

"Even the vultures will not eat the dead corpse of the ungrateful one who abandons the *āmnāyāgataṁ guru.*" In his commentary to this verse Śrīla Sanātana Gosvāmī writes: *āmnāyāgataṁ kula kramāyātaṁ*— This *āmnāyāgata guru* means a *guru* who has come in a family succession." Just before this, in his *dik darśiṇī ṭīkā* of verse 361, Sanātan Goswāmī quotes how many other *gurus* exist other than the spiritual master -

prasaṅgād anyeṣām api gurūṇāṁ saṅgrahārtham. te coktāḥ kaurme— upādhyāyaḥ pitā jyeṣṭha-bhrātā caiva mahīpatiḥ. mātulaḥ śvaśuraḥ sūto mātāmaha-pitāmahau. varṇa-jyeṣṭhaḥ pitṛvyaś ca sarve te guravaḥ smṛtāḥ.

"…others are also named Guru, as it is said in the Kūrma Purāṇa - the Veda-teacher, father, elder brother, king, mother and family, in-laws, parents' parents, upper caste people and other elders."

For example, Śrī Raghunātha dāsa Gosvāmī was initiated by the family-*guru* Yadunandana Ācārya, but he did not leave him to take *dīkṣā* from, for example, Śrī Rūpa Gosvāmī. On the contrary, in Mukta Caritra (4) he acknowledged that he had gotten everything from his family Guru Yadunandana Ācārya –

nāma śreṣṭhaṁ manum api śacī-putram atra svarūpaṁ
rūpaṁ tasyāgrajam uru purīṁ māthurīṁ goṣṭha-bāṭīm
rādhākuṇḍaṁ girivaram aho rādhikā mādhavāśāṁ
prāpto yasya prathita kṛpayā śrī guruṁ taṁ nato'smi

I bow down to my blessed Śrī Guru (Yadunandana Ācārya), by whose grace I have received the greatest name in existence, the holy name of Kṛṣṇa, the 18-syllable Gopāla-*mantra,* Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu, the son of Mother Śacī, Svarūpa Dāmodara, Rūpa Gosvāmī, his elder brother Sanātana Gosvāmī, the great city of Mathurā, the pastures of Vraja, Rādhākuṇḍa, the best of mountains Govardhana, and the hope of attaining Rādhikā and Mādhava.....

With Śrī Guru he could not have meant anyone else but Yadunandanācārya, for he lists all his other possible '*gurus*' like Mahāprabhu, Svarūpa Dāmodara and Rūpa Gosvāmī as his great gifts.

Gauḍīya Maṭha-teachers desperately try to shake off Haribhakti Vilāsa by writing (as Swami A.C. Bhaktivedānta did in his purport of Caitanya Caritāmṛta. (Madhya 1.35:)

"It is Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Gosvāmī's opinion, however, that to follow the Hari-bhakti-vilāsa strictly is to actually follow the Vaiṣṇava rituals in perfect order. He claims that the smārta-samāja, which is strictly followed by caste brāhmaṇas, has influenced portions that Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī collected from the original Hari-bhakti-vilāsa. It is

therefore very difficult to find out Vaiṣṇava directions from the book of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī."

However, when Śrīman Mahāprabhu outlines the contents of Haribhakti Vilāsa, he assures Sanātana Gosvāmīpāda; *yabe tumi likhibā kṛṣṇa korābe sphuraṇa,* "Kṛṣṇa will reveal to you what to write." (Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 24, 345) It was not written under pressure of *smārtas* but through the inspiration of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Indeed the word *smārta* never appeared in the 6 Gosvāmīs' books in any negative way.

Sanātana Gosvāmī clarifies in the very first verse of Haribhakti Vilāsa that he has written this book for the pleasure of the Vaiṣṇavas (and not for *smārtas* and bodily conscious people) - *caitanya-devaṁ bhagavantam āśraye śrī-vaiṣṇavānāṁ pramude'ñjasā likhan*. If indeed, he did appeasement, why did not Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī clarify it in the Dig-darśinī-ṭīkā written on those verses of Haribhakti Vilāsa? Why both Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī and Sanātana Gosvāmī are silent on this issue both in Haribhakti Vilāsa and in Dig-darśinī? Jīva Gosvāmī clarifies in the beginning of his Locana-rocanī-commentary on Ujjvala Nīlamaṇi that *svecchayā likhitaṁ kiñcit kiñcit likhitaṁ parecchayā* or "Some statements I have written according to my own desire, whereas some statements are written keeping into mind the desire of others". But, any such statement from the two authors themselves i.e. Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī and Sanātana Gosvāmī – have not been issued in the case of Haribhakti Vilāsa and its commentary.

In his purport to Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Madhya līlā 1, 63, Swami A.C Bhaktivedānta says:

"Śrī Rūpa, Śrī Sanātana and Śrī Haridāsa were prohibited from entering the Jagannātha Mandir and Lord Caitanya did not approve of such dogmatic prohibitions. To avoid unnecessary turmoil, however, these great personalities would not enter the Jagannatha temple."

The Caitanya Caritāmṛta text says, however:

haridāsa ṭhākura āra rūpa-sanātana
jagannātha-mandire nā yāna tina jana

"Haridāsa ṭhākura and Rūpa and Sanātana, these three men, did not go to the Jagannātha Mandir."

From this it is clear that they voluntary, out of sheer humility, did not enter the Jagannātha Mandir, not grudgingly, due to prohibition or to avoid turmoil. There is no mentioning anywhere in this Bengali text that they wanted to avoid turmoil, that they were prohibited to enter or that they protested or resisted such prohibitions. If that were so, then why did Sanātana Gosvāmī prefer to have his foot-soles scorched over having to touch Lord Jagannātha's *pūjārīs?* If Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu wanted to overthrow the caste system He could have done so easily. Pratāpa-rudra Mahārāja was at His feet:

prabhura nikaṭe āche joto bhakta-gaṇa; mora lāgi' tā-sabāre koriho nivedana
sei sab doyālu more hoiyā sadaya; mora lāgi' prabhu-pade karibe vinaya
tā-sobāra prasāde mile śrī-prabhura pāya; prabhu-kṛpā vinā mora rājya nāhi bhāya
yadi more kṛpā nā koribe gaurahari; rājya chāḍi' yogī hoi' hoibo bhikhārī

In a letter King Pratāpa-rudra requested Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya, "Please appeal to all the devotees associated with Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu and submit this petition to them on my behalf. If all the devotees associated with the Lord are favorably disposed toward me, they can submit my petition at the lotus feet of the Lord. "By the mercy of all the devotees, one can attain the shelter of the lotus feet of the Lord. Without His mercy, my kingdom does not appeal to me. If Gaurahari, Lord Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu, will not show mercy to me, I shall give up my kingdom, become a mendicant and beg from door to door."

With such influence Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu could have easily told the king to lift the ban on non-Hindus entering the Jagannāth Mandir so that Rūpa Gosvāmī, Sanātana Gosvāmī and Haridās Ṭhākur could enter, but there is no evidence from any *śāstra* that He never did that. During Advaita Prabhu's feast in honor of Mahāprabhu, when He had just taken *sannyāsa,* Śrīla Haridās Thākur humbly said:

mui pāpiṣṭha adhama, bāhire eka muṣṭi pāche korimu bhojan

(Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 3.63)

“I am a fallen sinner – I will eat a handful later, outside.” When Rūpa Gosvāmī’s dramas were about to be read to the Lord, Rūpa and Haridās humbly sat at the base of the platform where the other devotees were seated:

rūpa haridāsa duṅhe bosilā piṇḍātale; sabāra agre nā uṭhilā piṇḍāra upare
(Caitanya Caritāmṛta Antya 1.111)

When the *brāhmaṇa* Kālidāsa glorified his *śūdra*-friend Jhaḍu ṭhākura, stating that a low-caste devotee is greater than a non-devotee *brāhmaṇa*, Jhaḍu ṭhākura did not say: “Yes, you see I am greater than or equal to you!” Rather, he said:

śuni ṭhākura kohe – śāstre ei satya hoy; sei nīca nahe – yāte kṛṣṇa-bhakti hoy
āmi – nīca jāti, āmār nāhi kṛṣṇa-bhakti; anya aiche hoy, āmāy nāhi aiche śakti

“The scriptures speak the truth, a low caste person is not low if he/she has devotion for Kṛṣṇa. I, however, am low-born and I have no devotion for Kṛṣṇa. This may apply to others, but I do not have such a power.” (Caitanya Caritāmṛta Antya 16, 28-29)

These are perfect examples of *maryādā-pālana*, maintaining the etiquette.

Śrīman Mahāprabhu was **NOT AGAINST THE CASTE SYSTEM**. When He heard that Sanātana Gosvāmī had burned his footsoles to avoid touching Lord Jagannātha’s *pūjārīs*, He praised him, saying (Caitanya Caritāmṛta Antya 4, 129-132):

yadyapi tumi hao jagat pāvan; tomā sparśe pavitra hoy deva muni-gaṇa
tathāpi bhakta svabhāva - maryādā rakṣaṇa; maryādā pālana hoy sādhura bhūṣaṇa
maryādā laṅghane loka kore upahāsa ; iha loka, para loka - dui hoy nāśa
maryādā rakhile, tuṣṭa hoy mora mana ; tumi aiche nā korile kore kon jana?

"Although you are the purifier of the whole world and the gods and sages are purified by your mere touch, still it is the nature of a devotee to follow the social protocol. Maintaining the social protocol is the ornament of a *sādhu*. When a Vaiṣṇava violates the social protocol people will ridicule him and he will perish in this birth and in the next. By keeping the social standard you have pleased My mind. Who else but you could do such a thing?"

By saying: 'Although you are the purifier', Mahāprabhu acknowledges the spiritual superiority of a Vaiṣṇava, but then He immediately warns that the external social protocol must be maintained. These are two separate worlds, one spiritual and the other material.

Śrī Svarūpa Dāmodara and Śrī Rāmānanda Rāy wanted Śrīman Mahāprabhu to take a *brāhmaṇa* with Him – He would not eat grains from non-*brāhmaṇas :*

āmā duṅhāra mone tabe boro sukh hoy; ek nivedana yadi dhara, dayāmaya
'uttama brāhmaṇa' ek saṅge avaśya cāhi ; bhikṣā kori bhikṣā dibe jābe pātra bohi
banapathe jāite nāhi 'bhojyānna' brāhmaṇa; ājñā koro – saṅge coluk vipra ekjan

(Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 17.10-12)

"We would both be very happy if you could heed our plea, O merciful One! You should definitely travel with one topmost *brāhmaṇa,* who can beg alms for You, serve You these alms and carry your vessels. When you traverse the forest path You will have no *brāhmaṇa* with You who will cook and serve Your grains. Order us to send a *brāhmaṇa* along with You."

ye grāme rohen prabhu tathāya ***brāhmaṇa****; pānca sāt jan āsi kore nimantraṇa*
keho anna āni dey bhaṭṭācārya sthāne; keho dugdha dadhi keho ghṛta khaṇḍa āne
jāhā ***vipra nāhi tāhā 'śūdra mahājana'; āsi sabe bhaṭṭācārye kore vanya vyañjana***
bhaṭṭācārya pāka kore vanya vyañjana; vanya vyañjana prabhura ānandita mana

(Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 17.58-60)

"In whatever village the Lord stayed five to seven *brāhmaṇas* invited Him. Some gave grains to Bhaṭṭācārya, others gave milk, yoghurt, clarified butter or rock candy. Wherever there were no *brāhmaṇas* the great devotee-*śūdras* came and gave Bhaṭṭācārya forest-vegetables to cook for the Lord. Prabhu was very happy to eat these vegetables cooked by Bhaṭṭācārya." Note here that the Lord accepted only vegetables from the *śūdra*-devotees.

In Caitanya Caritāmṛta (Antya 10.139-141):

ācārya-ratna, ācārya-nidhi, nandana, rāghava; śrīvāsa-ādi joto bhakta, vipra sab

eimata nimantraṇa koren jatna kori; vāsudeva gadādhara, gupta murāri
kulīna-grāmī, khaṇḍavāsī, āra joto jan; jagannāthera prasāda āni koren nimantraṇa

"Devotees like Ācārya-ratna, Ācārya-nidhi, Nandana, Rāghava and Śrīvāsa were all *brāhmaṇas* and they invited the Lord for meals. Vāsudeva, Gadādhara, Murāri Gupta and the villagers from Kulīna and Khaṇḍa (who were not *brāhmaṇas*) brought *prasāda* from Lord Jagannātha." And later on in that chapter (verses 154-155):

gopīnāthācārya, jagadānanda, kāśīśvara;
bhagavān rāmabhadrācārya, śaṅkara, vakreśvara
madhye madhye ghara bhāte kore nimantraṇa;
anyera nimantraṇa prasāde kauḍi dui paṇa

"Gopīnāthācārya, Jagadānanda, Kāśīśvara; Bhagavān Rāmabhadrācārya, Śaṅkara, Vakreśvara (who were all *brāhmaṇas*) cooked for the Lord in their homes while others bought *prasāda* for Him for (a price of) 2 *kauḍis."*

*śrīvāsādi joto prabhura **vipra** bhakta-gaṇa; prabhuke bhikṣā dite hoilo sobākāra mana*

"(When the Lord took His first alms in Advaita Prabhu's house just after taking sannyāsa) Śrīvāsa and all the other ***brāhmaṇa-***devotees of the Lord wanted to invite the Lord for a meal." (Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 3. 168)

Caitanya Caritāmṛta Adi 7, text 45 –

kāśīte lekhaka śūdra-śrī candraśekhara; tāṅra ghare rahilā prabhu svatantra iśvara

translation by A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami-

"This time Lord Caitanya stayed at the house of Candrasekhara, although he was regarded as a *śūdra* or *kāyastha*, for the Lord, as the Supreme Personality of Godhead, is completely independent."

TEXT 46

tapana-miśrera ghare bhikṣā-nirvāhaṇa; sannyāsīra saṅge nāhi māne nimantraṇa

SYNONYMS

tapana-miśrera—of Tapana Miśra; ghare—in the house; bhikṣā—accepting food; nirvāhaṇa—regularly executed; sannyāsīra—with other Māyāvādī sannyāsīs; saṅge—in company with them; nāhi—never; māne—accepted; nimantraṇa—invitation

TRANSLATION

As a matter of principle, Lord Caitanya regularly accepted His food at the house of Tapana Miśra. He never mixed with other sannyasis, nor did He accept invitations from them.

Note that neither the words 'as a matter of principle' nor the word 'regularly' are mentioned in the original verse, as if there were no strict rules about Mahāprabhu eating only from born Brahmins. He simply only ate from Tapan Miśra, period.

candraśekhara-gṛhe kaila dui māsa vāsa; tapana-miśrera ghare bhikṣā dui māsa

Ādi 10,154 – "The Lord stayed in Candraśekhara's house for two months and ate in Tapan Miśra's house for two months." Tapan Miśra was a Brahmin by birth and though Mahāprabhu generously stayed in the house of a *śūdra*, He would not eat his foodgrains.

Also in Caitanya Bhāgavata (Antya 9.118-119) it is described that Mahāprabhu ate only from *brāhmaṇas* -

*tathā bhikṣā āmāra, ye hoy lakṣeśvara; śuniyā **brāhmaṇa** sab cintita antara*
***vipragaṇa** stuti kori bolen gosāi; lakṣera ki dāy sahasreko kāro nāi*

-

"I will invite invitations only from those who have one lakh. Hearing this, the ***brāhmaṇas*** were all worried. The ***vipras*** said 'O Lord, what to speak of a lakh, we don't have even a thousand." It is also very clear from all these quotations that no one in Mahāprabhu's entourage was initiated as a *brāhmaṇa* without being born one first, otherwise the above distinction would not have been made.

Although Mahāprabhu played the pastime that a *brāhmaṇa* and *sannyāsī* can be enlightened by a *śūdra* and a *gṛhastha* like Rāmānanda Rāya, who, in Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya līlā chapter 8, took Him to the limit of perfection as a *śikṣā guru* (*kibā vipra kibā nyāsī śūdra kene noy ye kṛṣṇa tattva vettā sei guru hoy)*, Mahāprabhu would not accept meals from him *– heno kāle vaidika eka vaiṣṇava brāhmana daṇḍavat*

kori koilo prabhura nimantraṇa (Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 8.45) “At that time a Vedic Vaiṣṇava *brāhmaṇa* came and invited Mahāprabhu.” This proves that external protocol and spiritual appreciation are two separate worlds, that should not be mixed. Speaking of the *kibā vipra kibā nyāsi* verse, those eager to usurp the position of a *brāhmaṇas* love to quote this verse to suggest that Mahāprabhu said that every Joe Brown can become a *dīkṣā*-Guru; however, they forget the context in which this verse was spoken. Although Himself a *brāhmaṇa* and a *sannyāsī,* Mahāprabhu considered the *śūdra* and *gṛhastha* Rāmānanda Rāya to be His *śikṣā guru,* since He was on the receiving end of all the enlightenment passed on by Rāmānanda Rāya. Four verses earlier Mahāprabhu said about His personal *āśrama*-status:

māyāvādī āmi to sannyāsī; bhakti tattva nāhi jāni māyāvāde bhāsi
sārvabhauma saṅge mora mon nirmala hoilo; kṛṣṇa bhakti tattva koho, tāhāre puchilo
tiho kohe āmi nāhi jāni kṛṣṇa kothā; sabe rāmānanda jāne; tiho nāhi ethā
tomāra ṭhāi āilām tomāra mahimā śuniyā; tumi more stuti koro sannyāsī jāniyā

“I am a *māyāvādī sannyāsī*, hence I don’t know about *bhakti.* I was purified in Sārvabhauma’s company, so I asked him: ‘Tell Me about Kṛṣṇa. He (Sārvabhauma, although he was a *brāhmaṇa*) said: “I don’t know about Kṛṣṇa. Rāmānanda knows all, but he is not here.” “So I have come here after hearing of your greatness, but you praise Me because I am a *sannyāsī.*” And THEN Mahāprabhu speaks the famous verse, in THIS context –

kibā vipra kibā nyāsi śūdra kene noy; yei kṛṣṇa tattva vettā sei guru hoy

- nowhere and never did Rāmānanda Rāya give *dīkṣā* to Mahāprabhu. The context of this verse is a personal one, and secondly there is no question here of *dīkṣā.* The word *guru* in this verse means *śikṣā guru.* After the famous *kibā vipra*-verse Mahāprabhu continues: *sannyāsī boliyā more nā koro vañcana; kṛṣṇa rādhā tattva kohi’ pūrṇa koro man* “Don’t deprive Me because I am a *sannyāsī*; fulfil My desire my speaking of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā.”

This verse appears 3 times in Caitanya Caritāmṛta (Madhya 19,50, Madhya 20,58 and Antya 16,25):

na me 'bhaktaś catur-vedī mad-bhaktaḥ śva-pacaḥ priyaḥ
tasmai deyaṁ tato grāhyaṁ sa ca pūjyo yathā hy aham

Let us study the word-for-word by A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami:

na — not; me — My; abhaktaḥ — devoid of pure devotional service; catuḥ-vedī — a scholar in the four Vedas; mat-bhaktaḥ — My devotee; śva-pacaḥ — even from a family of dog-eaters; priyaḥ — very dear; tasmai — to him (a pure devotee, even though born in a very low family); deyam — should be given; tataḥ — from him; grāhyam — should be accepted ***(remnants of food)****; saḥ — that person; ca — also; pūjyaḥ — worshipable; yathā — as much as; hi — certainly; aham — I.*

TRANSLATION

"(Lord Kṛṣṇa said:) 'Even though a person is a very learned scholar of the Sanskrit Vedic literatures, he is not accepted as My devotee unless he is pure in devotional service. Even though a person is born in a family of dog-eaters, he is very dear to Me if he is a pure devotee who has no motive to enjoy fruitive activities or mental speculation. Indeed, all respects should be given to him, and **whatever** he offers should be accepted. Such devotees are as worshipable as I am.'"

However, the words ‘whatever’ and especially ‘food remnants’ are not there in the original *śloka*. When and where did the Brahmin Mahāprabhu ever eat grains from non-brahmin devotees?

Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 1,283:

raghunātha-dāsa nityānanda-pāśe gelā; ciḍā-dadhi-mahotsava tāhāṅi karilā

raghunātha-dāsa—Raghunātha dāsa; nityānanda—Lord Nityānanda; pāśe—near; gelā—went; ciḍā-chipped rice; dadhi—curd; mahotsava—festival; tāhāṅi—there; ***karilā - performed****.*

“At this time, Raghunātha dāsa approached Śrī Nityānanda Prabhu and, according to His order, prepared a feast and distributed prasādam composed of chipped rice and curd.”

Here it is insinuated that Raghunāth dās Goswāmī cooked the feast himself, but later, in Antya 6.56, it is clearly described:

boro boro mṛt kuṇḍikā ānāilo pāca sate; ***eka vipra*** *prabhu lāgi ciḍā bhijāya tāte*

"He also obtained five or seven especially large earthen pots, and in these pots **a brāhmin** began soaking chipped rice for the satisfaction of Lord Nityānanda." (BBT Translation)

Concluding, the *daiva varnāśrama* project is *pratiyogitā*, envious rivalry – in Śrīmad Bhāgavata Lord Kapila says (3.29.8) –

*abhisandhāya yo hiṁsāṇ dambhaṁ **mātsaryam** eva vā*
saṁrambhī bhinna dṛg bhāvaṁ mayi kuryāt sa tāmasaḥ

*Abhisandhāya – with the intention of; yaḥ - whoever; hiṁsān – with violence; dambhaṁ - deceitful; **mātsaryam – with envy**; eva – surely; vā – or; saṁrambhī – an angry or proud person; bhinna dṛk – separate view; bhāvaṁ - such a mood; mayi – unto Me; kuryāt – does; sa – he; tāmasaḥ - darkness.*

"An angry and proud person who worships me with intentions of violence, duplicity **and envy**, having a dualistic vision about others, is rendering *tāmasik bhakti* towards Me."

20) MIXED MARRIAGES IN ISKCON AND GAUḌĪYA MATH-

In ISKCON and Gauḍīya Māṭh Africans are married to Eskimos, Latinos with Chinese and Brahmins with Russians. Spiritual oneness and equality is transported down to the physical plane, with the slogan 'we are all spirit souls anyway'. If we are all **only** spirit souls, with no subtle cultural coverings at all, then - 1) Why marry at all, because we are not at all this body (why even dress then?) 2) Why not marry a fly or a pig? They are also spirit souls. Despite ISKCON's artificial policy of spiritual equality there are huge cultural and economic differences between all the peoples that join the organization – the result of genetically mixing them up is confused children who are part of neither parents' ethnicity or culture. This is called *varṇa saṅkara*, or a mixed race, in Bhagavad Gītā (1.41-43). Spouses from poor countries (especially Indian men) exploit their rich spouses (usually naive gullible western girls). After they flattered them into sending them a plane ticket to the rich west they call them prostitutes and abandon them to start businesses in the west. For material relationships one must follow material rules. Śrīmad Bhāgavata says: (11.17.39) *gṛhārthī sadṛśīṁ bhāryām* „A *brahmacārī* who wants to marry should seek a bride like

him." *sadṛśīṁ* (like him) is glossed by Śrīdhara Swāmī as *savarṇa*, 'of the same caste'. A marriage **CAN** be spiritual, as a side effect, but it is never the root cause of marriage. "I want sex, but only with a devotee girl/boy." But the first motive is sex, not *bhakti*.

Bhaktivinoda writes in Jaiva-dharma, chapter 6 –

ye mata yavana-vaṁśīya viśuddha brahma svabhāva sampanna vyakti vastutaḥ pāramārthika viṣaye brāhmaṇa hoiyāchen, tathāpi vyavahārika kriyā ye brāhmaṇa kanyāra pāṇi-grahaṇa tāhāte tāhār adhikāra hoy nā –

"Though a person born in a *yavana*-family may have accrued the pure nature of a *brāhmaṇa,* and thus actually became a *brāhmaṇa* from the spiritual perspective, still he has no right to perform material actions like marrying a *brāhmaṇa*-girl."

21) CAN *SANNYĀSA* BE ABANDONED?

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami writes in his commentary on Śrīmad Bhāgavata (8.2.30) –

"Especially in this age, Kali-yuga, it is advised that no one take sannyāsa.

aśvamedhaṁ gavālambhaṁ sannyāsaṁ pala-paitṛkam
devareṇa sutotpattiṁ kalau pañca vivarjayet
(Cc. Ādi 17.164 - Brahma-vaivarta Purāṇa)

From this we can understand that in this age the sannyāsa-āśrama is forbidden because people are not strong. Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu showed us an example in taking sannyāsa at the age of twenty-four years, but even Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya advised Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu to be extremely careful because He had taken sannyāsa at an early age. For preaching we give young boys sannyāsa, but actually it is being experienced that they are not fit for sannyāsa. There is no harm, however, if one thinks that he is unfit for sannyāsa; if he is very much agitated sexually, he should go to the āśrama where sex is allowed, namely the gṛhastha-āśrama. That one has been found to be very weak in one place does not mean that he should stop fighting the crocodile of māyā. One should take shelter of the lotus feet of Kṛṣṇa, as we shall see Gajendra do, and at the same time one can be a gṛhastha if he is satisfied with sexual indulgence. There is no need to give up the fight. Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu therefore recommended, sthāne sthitāḥ śruti-gatāṁ tanu-vāṅ-manobhiḥ. One may stay in whichever āśrama is suitable for him; it is not essential that one take sannyāsa. If one is sexually agitated, he can enter the gṛhastha-āśrama. But one must continue fighting. For one who is not in a transcendental position, to take sannyāsa artificially is not a very great credit. If sannyāsa is not suitable, one may enter

the grhastha-āśrama and fight māyā with great strength. But one should not give up the fighting and go away.

Response:

a. If *sannyāsa* is given for preaching, then is it not counterproductive preaching and leading to ridicule rather than respect to have all one's *sannyāsīs* fall down?

b. Encouraging *sannyāsīs* to 'stay and get married' is a violation of Vedic and Vaiṣṇava rule. Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu condemned fallen *sannyāsīs* to death. He rejected Junior Haridāsa and, when Haridās finally committed suicide, He said:

śuni prabhu hāsi kohe suprasanna citta; prakṛta darśana koile ei prāyaścitta

(Caitanya Caritāmṛta Antya 2.165): 'When the Lord heard this He was very satisfied and said: 'This is the atonement for looking at a woman'. Also Śrīmad Bhāgavata (7.15.36) says that they are *vantāśī*, vomit-eaters, and *apatrapa*, shameless (if they maintain their lives):

yaḥ pravrajya gṛhāt pūrvaṁ trivargāvapanāt punaḥ
yadi seveta tān bhikṣuḥ sa vai vāntāśyapatrapaḥ

"He who previously strayed from home (as a recluse), giving up sense pleasure and so forth, and then returns to that, is surely a shameless fellow and an eater of his own vomit."

c. Swamījī's above concession sends a signal to new candidates to take their *sannyāsa*-vows cheaply, since they can marry again without any problem afterwards. It creates a precedent for falldown and devalues the *sannyāsa āśrama*.

d. Isn't it better to prevent than to cure? Giving *sannyāsa* to 20-year old western boys with such a low cultural background is bound to fail. Preaching is not a ground to give *sannyāsa* to young westerners - a vow of lifelong celibacy. The western audience is anyway not impressed nor does it respect saffron cloth, like Indians. They simply know nothing about it! Indeed, all devotees who opened the temples in America and Europe were white-clad householders!

It is also not that every individual has to marry at 25 and has to take *sannyāsa* or enter the forest at 50. This depends on the individual's propensity. Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī comments on Śrīmad Bhāgavata 1.9.26:

na hi brahmacaryādaya āśrama-dharmāḥ sarvair eva dvijaiḥ sarve krameṇaivānuṣṭheyā iti niyamaḥ. kintu vairāgyaṁ cet sadaiva bhikṣavo bhaveyus tadā rāgaś ced gṛhasthā eva sadeti -

"It is not that every *brāhmaṇa* is passing through the succession of all four *āśramas*. If one is detached by nature one should always be a mendicant and when one is naturally attached one should always be a *gṛhastha*."

Only two years before he wrote the sober and modest 8.2.30 purport, Swāmījī was much more boastful, in his purport of Caitanya Caritāmṛta Adi 7.67 –

Sometimes it is challenged that the sannyāsīs who are preaching in the Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement are not genuine because they do not belong to brāhmaṇa families, for Māyāvādīs do not offer sannyāsa to one who does not belong to a brāhmaṇa family by birth. Unfortunately, however, they do not know that at present everyone is born a śūdra (kalau śūdra-sambhavaḥ). It is to be understood that there are no brāhmaṇas in this age because those who claim to be brāhmaṇas simply on the basis of birthright do not have the brahminical qualifications. However, even if one is born in a non-brāhmaṇa family, if he has the brahminical qualifications he should be accepted as a brāhmaṇa, as confirmed by Śrīla Nārada Muni and the great saint Śrīdhara Svāmī. This is also stated in Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam. Both Nārada and Śrīdhara Svāmī completely agree that one cannot be a brāhmaṇa by birthright but must possess the qualities of a brāhmaṇa. Thus in our Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement we never offer the sannyāsa order to a person whom we do not find to be qualified in terms of the prescribed brahminical principles. Although it is a fact that unless one is a brāhmaṇa he cannot become a sannyāsī, it is not a valid principle that an unqualified man who is born in a brāhmaṇa family is a brāhmaṇa whereas a brahminically qualified person born in a non-brāhmaṇa family cannot be accepted. The Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement strictly follows the injunctions of Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam, avoiding misleading heresy and manufactured conclusions.

Refutation:

1. Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī must then also be a *māyāvādī*, because he comments on Bhagavad-Gita 18.66: *parityajya sannyasyeti na vyākhyeyam arjunasya kṣatriyatvena sannyāsādhikārāt na cā* – *"parityajya* cannot be explained as *sannyāsa* because, being a *kṣatriya,* Arjuna had no right for that."

2. Śrīmad Bhāgavata (11.17.38) clearly says that *sannyāsa* is only for *brāhmaṇas* - *pravrajed vā dvijottamaḥ.*
3. Which *śāstra* mentions this phrase *kalau śūdra sambhavaḥ*?
4. How can Swāmījī claim that **not a single** Brahmin is qualified nowadays? Does he know every single one of them? If *kalau śūdra sambhava* was a valid text and a blanket statement, and every single person in Kali is a *śūdra,* then what about Advaita Prabhu, Nityānanda Prabhu, the entire *pañca tattva* and 5 of the 6 Goswāmīs? They and their descendants and the other innumerable qualified *brāhmaṇas* are all *śūdras* or so?
5. Do Nārada and Śrīdhar Swāmī say anywhere that all American hippies deserve to wear a Brahmin thread?
6. If Swāmījī **never** offered *sannyāsa* to unqualified persons, then why 47 of Swāmījī's 56 western *sannyāsīs* fell down?
7. Then Swāmījī contradicts himself by admitting '*Although it is a fact that unless one is a brāhmaṇa he cannot become a sannyāsī..'*

***JĪVA*-ISSUE**

22) THE ORIGIN OF THE *JĪVA*

A.C. Bhaktividanta Swami: - *So even in the Vaikuṇṭha, if I desire that "Why shall I serve Kṛṣṇa? Why not become Kṛṣṇa?" I immediately fall down"……"Whatever it may be, the falldown is there. So because we are living entities, we are not as powerful as Kṛṣṇa, THEREFORE WE MAY FALL DOWN FROM VAIKUṆṬHA AT ANY MOMENT"***.**
July 8, 1976, Washington DC Conversations ……

A.C. Bhaktividanta Swami, Kṛṣṇa-book chapter 87:

"Similarly, the living entities who have come down to this material world have made their own choice to enjoy this material world. It is not that Kṛṣṇa sent them into this material world. The material world is created for the enjoyment of living entities who wanted to give up the eternal service of the Lord to become the supreme enjoyer themselves. According to Vaiṣṇava philosophy, when a living entity desires to gratify his senses and forgets the service of the Lord, he is given a place in the material world to act freely according to his desire, and therefore he creates a condition of life in which he either enjoys or suffers."

Response: It is said in **Śrīmad Bhāgavata** (2.9.10) **—**

pravartate yatra rajas tamas tayoḥ sattvaṁ ca miśraṁ na ca kāla vikramaḥ
***na yatra māyā** kim utāpare harer anuvratā yatra surāsurārcitāh*

"In Vaikuṇṭha there is no mode of passion, darkness or mixed goodness, there is no power of time, and **no *māyā* (who can pull a devotee out of the spiritual sky)."**

In Caitanya Caritāmṛta (Madhya 20.117) *kṛṣṇa bhuli sei jīva anādi bahirmukha* one should note the word *anādi,* the soul's forgetfulness of Kṛṣṇa is beginningless.

In **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 4.28.52** it is mentioned that the *jīva* was with God, but according to **Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī in his 'Sārārtha Darśinī'**-commentary the *jīva* here only merged with Him as Mahāviṣṇu during the universal dissolution. (*mayy eva militva* means) "Being merged in Me (Mahāviṣṇu) you experienced happiness by My association." *sahasraṁ parivatsarān mahāpralayo yāvad ityartha* "Until the end of the great dissolution." (Viśvanātha's *ṭīkā* of verse 54). Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī declares in his comment on Śrīmad Bhāgavata **4.28.64**:

*svasthaḥ prādhānikāveśa rahitaḥ san tad vyabhicāreṇa pūrvam īśvarākhya haṁsa bahirmukhatayā naṣṭāṁ tirohitāṁ smṛtiṁ jānāsi api kiṁ sakhāyaṁ mām iti api smarasi cātmānam avijñāta sakham ityatra pūrvoktaṁ sakhyānusandhānam punar āpa iti. atra punaḥ śabdena smṛti śabdena tad vismṛter nāśādi khaṇḍanaṁ vivakṣitam kintu anādyāvṛtasyāpi sakhyasya svābhāvikatvād **anāditvam** ityeva kṛta hānya kṛtābhyāgama prasaṅgāt*

"Being *svasthaḥ* means 'being free from the possession of material nature" *tad vyabhicāreṇa* means 'not devoted to the swan called *īśvara*'. Because of this the memory was lost - *naṣṭāṁ. punar āpa* means 'regained the consciousness of friends' as was stated in words such as *jānāsi kiṁ sakhāyam mām* (4.28.52). Here the use of the words '*punaḥ*' and *smṛtiḥ* are used to indicate the disappearance or destruction of forgetfulness. But that forgetfulness is *certainly beginningless* although the friendship, which is also covered without beginning, is natural." In **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 4.29.70** it is said:

nāhaṁ mameti bhāvo'yaṁ puruṣe vyavadhīyate

*yāvad buddhimano'kṣārtha guṇa vyūho h**yanādimān***

'The feeling of 'I' and 'mine' (with regard to the physical body), inherent in the *jīva*, does not cease, so long the subtle body - which consists of the intelligence, the mind etc., and which exists since *beginningless time* - remains." In **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 5.26.3** it is said *hy**ānādy**avidyayā kṛta kāmānāṁ,* due to beginningless ignorance, the living beings have been cherishing lusty desires." In **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 6.5.11** *bhū kṣetraṁ jīva saṁjñaṁ yad **anādi** nija bandhanam.* "The earth is a field known as the *jīva* who has been conditioned since *beginningless time*", **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 8.24.46** ***anādyavidyo**pahatātma saṁvida* "True knowledge of the self stands obscured by beginningless ignorance." **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 11.2.37** *bhayaṁ dvitīyābhiniveśataḥ syād īśād apetasya viparyayo'smṛtiḥ,* the *apeta,* or turning away from God by the *jīva* is *anādi*, beginningless and that also counts for fear *bhaya. asmṛti* means, according to Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī, not forgetting Kṛṣṇa, but the own spiritual nature. *viparyaya* means taking something for what it isn't, like identifying oneself with the body, which one is not. **Śrīmad Bhāgavata (11.11.4) says:**

ekasyaiva mamāṁśasya jīvasyaiva mahāmate
*bandho'sy**āvidyayānādir** vidyayā ca tathetaraḥ*

Śrī Kṛṣṇa tells Uddhava: 'Although I am one, O highly intelligent one, it is in relation to the *jīva* alone, which is a reflection of Mine, that bondage has existed due to *beginningless ignorance*." **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 11.11.7** *yo'vidyayā yuk sa tu nitya-baddho vidyāmayo yaḥ sa tu nitya muktaḥ—* "*The ignorant soul is eternally bound* and the soul filled with knowledge is eternally free." **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 11.22.10** *anādyavidyā-yuktasya puruṣasyātma vedanam* "The soul, which is ignorant from beginningless time, cannot get knowledge from itself." **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 12.11.29,** *anādy avidyayā* and **Vedānta Sūtra 2.1.35:** *na karma vibhāgād iti cenn**ānāditvāt*** "If someone says that the theory of *karma* cannot explain the inequality within the world, because everyone must have had the same *karma* in the beginning of creation, then that is not true, for *karma is beginningless*." In the Padma Purāṇa, Uttara Khaṇḍa, Lord Śiva tells His wife Pārvatī: *krīḍārthaṁ deva devena sṛṣṭā māyā jaganmayī* - "The God of Gods has created this worldly illusion for His play."

Śrīpāda Śrīdhara Svāmī says that forgetting God in the famous *'bhayaṁ dvitīyābhiniveśataḥ'*-verse **(11.2.37)** means: *bhagavataḥ svarūpāsphūrtis tato viparyayo*

dehāsmīti "Not having a vision of God's own form. Hence one thinks: I am the body." An alternative reading says: *iśa vimukhasya tan māyayā'smṛtiḥ svarūpāsphūrtiḥ,* 'Forgetfulness of God means that one does not perceive ones own *svarupa*..." Nothing about falling from Goloka here....

Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī's Prīti Sandarbha, paragraph 1:

*atha jīvaśca tadīyo'pi tajjñānasaṁsargābhāva-yuktatvena tan māyā parābhūtaḥ sannātma svarūpa jñāna lopān māyā kalpitopādhyāveśācc**anādi saṁsāra** duḥkena sambadhyate.....paramātma vaibhava gaṇane ca tat taṭastha śakti rūpānāṁ cid eka rasānām apy**anādi paratattva jñāna saṁsargābhāva** māyā tad vaimukhya labdha cchidrayā tan māyayāvṛtasva svarūpa jñānānāṁ tayaive sattva rajas tamomaye jaḍe prādhāne racitātma bhāvānāṁ jīvānāṁ saṁsāra duḥkaṁ ca jñāpitam*

"Although the *jīva* is part of the Lord, he is without knowledge of Him and this deficiency *has no beginning*. Because of this he is covered by *māyā.* Thus he is united with the beginningless material miseries because his knowledge of his *svarūpa* is covered and he is absorbed in false designations.....*From beginningless time* he is bereft of knowledge of the Supreme truth and thus he has attained the fault of aversion towards God, whose *māyā* covers over his knowledge of his constitutional position and fills him with feelings created by *māyā*."

Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī's Bhakti Sandarbha, paragraph 121 says: *muktā api prapadyante punaḥ samsāra vāsanām yadyacintya mahāśaktau bhagavatyaparādhinaḥ.* "Offenders to the Lord will again get material desires, even if they are liberated souls." Here the word 'again' proves that this verse does not apply to eternally liberated souls who fall from the spiritual world. The offenders mentioned here are *māyāvādīs* that are described in **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 10.2.32.** *āruhya kṛcchreṇa paraṁ padaṁ tataḥ patantyadho'nādṛta yuṣmad aṅghrayaḥ.* But this does not count for the *bhaktas,* as is described in the next verse **10.2.33** *tathā na te mādhava tāvakāḥ kvacid bhraśyanti mārgāt tvayi baddha sauhṛdāḥ***.** Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī comments: *yathā pūrve ārūḍha parama pādatvāvasthāto'pi bhṛśyanti, tathā tāvakā mārgāt sādhanāvasthāto'pi na bhṛśyanti, kim uta mṛgyāt tvatta ityarthaḥ* "*māyāvādīs* fall down even from the stage of perfection, but even in the stage of *sādhana* Your devotees do not fall down, what to speak of after attaining You?"

Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī's commentary on Śrīmad Bhāgavata 3.7.10 —

*tatra bhagavataḥ pṛṣṭha sthitayā **anādyavidyayā** tamaḥ svarūpayā **anādi vaimukhya** rūpa bhagavat pṛṣṭha-sthānāṁ jīvānāṁ jñānam yal lupyate tasya na vastutvam **kāraṇam nāpi prayojanaṁ kim apy asti***

"**Ignorance, which is beginningless**, is situated on the Lord's back. She covers the knowledge of the *jīvas* who are situated on the Lord's back and are non devotees. **Their failure of knowledge is *anādi*, beginningless**. There is no reality to it and **no cause and purpose for it**."

Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī's commentary on Bhagavad-Gītā 15.16 —

*kṣarākṣarayor arthaṁ punar viśadayati sarvāṇi bhūtāni eko jīva eva **anādy-avidyayā** svarūpa-vicyutaḥ san karma-paratantraḥ samaṣṭy-ātmako brahmādi-sthāvarāntāni bhūtāni bhavatīty arthaḥ*

“Again, to specifically explain the meanings of the words *kṣara* and *akṣara*, Śrī Bhagavān says: *sarvāṇi bhūtāni*. Only the *jīva* is deprived of its spiritual identity due to **beginningless ignorance**. Being bound by his *karma*, he wanders throughout all species of life beginning from Brahmā, the aggregate self, down to the immobile beings.”

Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī's commentary on **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 10.87.32** also shows no *jīvas* that have fallen from the spiritual world:

te ca meghopamayā avidyayā āvṛtā baddha jīvā eke anye bhaktimajjñānena tad āvaraṇonmuktā mukta jīvāḥ anye kevalayā pradhānībhūtayā vā bhaktyā tadāvaraṇonmocita prāpita cid ānandamaya bhajanopayogi śarīraḥ siddha bhaktā anye avidyā yoga rahitā eva nitya pārṣadā iti caturvidhāḥ

"There are four types of *jīvas*:

1. *baddha*— those under the influence of the *avidyā* potency.
2. *mukta*— those liberated from the covering of *avidyā* through *bhakti,* but who have not yet attained a spiritual body. These are also called *jīvanmuktas* or liberated while living in the material body.
3. *siddha*— Those who have attained a *siddha deha* on the strength of *bhakti.* These are called *baddha muktas* or those liberated after being in bondage.
4. *nitya pārṣadas*— Those eternally free from contact with ignorance. They are also called *nitya siddhas* or *nitya muktas.*"

None of these four include souls fallen from the spiritual world.

In his comment on Bhagavad Gītā 13.20 Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī declares that the conditioning of the conditioned souls is beginningless— *māyā jīvayor api macchaktitvena anāditvāt tayoḥ saṁśleṣo'py anādir iti bhāvaḥ*. "Illusion and the conditioned souls are both My energies. They are both beginningless and they have been interconnected since beginningless time as well." The word *dveṣa* in **Bhagavad**

Gītā 7.27 does not mean envy of Kṛṣṇa, for you cannot be envious of someone you don't know. In Bṛhad Bhāgavatāmṛta Sarūpa calls himself a newcomer, *'nūtna'* –

dūre'stu tāvad vārteyaṁ tatra nitya nivāsinām;
na tiṣṭhed anusandhānaṁ nūtnānāṁ mādṛśām api, **B.B. 2.6.359)**

And in **2.6.366 -**

tallokasya svabhāvo'yaṁ kṛṣṇa saṅgaṁ vināpi yat;
bhavet tatraiva tiṣṭhāsā na cikīrṣā ca kasyacit

"Nobody desires to leave Goloka."

When Gopakumāra arrived in Goloka, the *gopīs* did not recognise him, which they would have if he had previously fallen from Goloka. Instead, they said: *ko'trāgato vā kim idaṁ cakāra* – "Who has come here and what has he done (to our Kṛṣṇa, who has fainted)?" (**B.B. 2.6.62**) Kṛṣṇa Himself saw Gopakumāra **as if** he was a long lost friend, not an **actually** lost friend - *cirādṛṣṭa prāṇa-priya sakham* ***iva****vāpya sa tu māṁ* – "He attained me **as if** I was a long lost friend." (*iva* means 'as if') (**B.B. 2.6.76**) Earlier in this chapter Kṛṣṇa said to Śrīdāma: "Now I have found my friend Sarūpa", *sarūpaḥ prāpto me suhṛd iti vadann* (**B.B. 2.6.55**), without any adjective like 'the fallen devotee coming back' or so. If one argues "Well, why did Kṛṣṇa recognise Gopakumāra at all then, if he had never been to Goloka before?", Kṛṣṇa Himself replies to that (**Bhagavad Gītā 7.26**):

vedāhaṁ samatītāni vartamānāni cārjunaḥ
bhaviṣyāṇāṁ ca bhūtānāṁ māṁ tu veda na kaścana

"Arjuna, I know past, present and future and all living beings, but nobody knows Me." The conditioned soul does not know Kṛṣṇa, but Kṛṣṇa knows the conditioned soul and its future.

Baladeva Vidyabhūṣaṇa writes in his Govinda Bhāṣya on **Vedānta Sūtra 4.4.22**: *na ca sarveśvaraḥ śrī hariḥ svādhina muktaṁ svalokāt-kadācit pātyitum icchet mukto vā kadācit taṁ jīhased iti śakyaṁ saṅkitum*. "One cannot even imagine that the Supreme Lord Hari would ever desire that the liberated souls fall down, nor would the liberated souls ever desire to leave the Lord." In his **Laghu Bhāgavatāmṛta (5.235)** Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī glosses the word *sādhvasa* in **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 2.9.9** as 'the residents of Vaikuṇṭha being free from the fear of falling."

Commenting on **Śrīmad Bhāgavata 10.87.30**, by the personified Vedas, Śrīla Sanātana Gosvāmī quotes a question to Mārkaṇḍeya in the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* (1.81.12):

ekaikasmin nare muktiṁ kalpe kalpe gate dvija
abhaviṣyaj jagac chūnyaṁ kālasyāder abhāvataḥ

“ O Brāhmaṇa, because time has no beginning, even if one person achieved liberation in each of the bygone *kalpas*, by now the world would be empty.”

Mārkaṇḍeya replied (81.13,14):

jīvasyānyasya sargeṇa nare muktim upāgate
acintya-śaktir bhagavān jagat pūrayate sadā
brahmaṇā saha mucyante brahma-lokam upāgatāḥ
sṛjyante ca mahā kalpe tad-vidhāścāpare janāḥ

“When someone is liberated, the Supreme Lord who has inconceivable potency, creates another *jīva* and thus always keeps the world full. Those who achieve *brahma-loka* become liberated along with Brahmā. Then in the next *Mahā kalpa* the Lord creates similar beings.” Haridās ṭhākur explains in the Caitanya Caritāmṛta (**Antya 3.78-79**)

haridāsa bole,—"tomāra yāvat martye sthiti; tāvat sthāvara-jaṅgama, sarva jīva-jāti
sab mukta kori' tumi vaikuṇṭhe pāṭhāibā; sūkṣma-jīve punaḥ karme udbuddha koribā

Haridāsa said, "My Lord, as long as You are situated within the materiaI world, You will send to the spirituaI sky all the deveIoped moving and nonmoving living entities in different species. Then again You will awaken the living entities who are not yet developed and engage them in activities. In this way all moving and nonmoving living entities will come into existence, and the entire universe will be filled as it was previously.”

This means they are even lower than immobile beings, it does not mean they are new creations. They are simply completely unconscious. This is quite the reverse of the theory that we not only fell from the spiritual world, but then started off as Lord Brahmā as our first conditioned life-form.

Assuming that previously fallen *jīvas* that return to the spiritual world are superior to those who have stayed, because they are shocked by their experience, is a

speculation and an offence to the *nitya muktas*, as if it is better to fall down than to stay. That would make devotion out of fear of punishment greater than spontaneous loving devotion, and would really make the spiritual world into a concentration-camp.

Regarding the fall of Jaya and Vijaya:

There are instances where marginal energy jiva souls have fallen from the spiritual world, just like Jaya and Vijaya. So the potency to fall under the influence of the lower energy is always there. And thus the individual jiva soul is called as Krishna's marginal energy."

– A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami, letter to Rayarama, December 2, 1968

Refutation: The feeling of enmity they acquired for the Lord was not because of the Kumāras' curse, but by the will of the Lord. Even so, the Lord did not consider them His enemies. He just wanted to enjoy fighting with them.

Sārārtha darśinī 3.16.26 states –

jaya-vijayayor eva prema-vijṛmbhitā kācid icchā. sā tu bho prabhuvara devādhideva vaikuṇṭha-nātha anyatrālpa-balatvāt. asmāsu prātikūlyābhāvāt yadi tatra bhavato yuyutsā-sukhaṁ na sampadyate, tadā āvām eva kenāpi prakāreṇa pratikūlīkṛtya tad-yuddha-sukham anubhūyatām ity āvayos tvat-sarva-sukha-paripūrṇatāyām aṇu-mātram api nyūnatvam asahamānayoḥ kiṅkarayoḥ prārthanā haṭhaḥ sva-bhakta-vātsalya-guṇam api laghūkṛtya niṣpādyatām ...

"Jaya and Vijaya had a desire arising from *prema.* "O best Lord! O Lord of lords! Lord of Vaikuṇṭha! If your fighting instinct is not satisfied because everyone else is so weak, and because we are not your enemies, then make us two guards unfriendly towards you, and you can have pleasure in fighting us. Since we servants cannot tolerate even a small degree of decrease in your full happiness, we pray that this should be done, by necessarily ignoring your quality of affection for your devotee."

Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī says that their inimical feelings were not real but feigned (*ābhāsa*). They entered into demoniac bodies but remained untouched within.

The verse in Caitanya Caritāmṛta (**Madhya 20, 118**) *daṇḍya jane rājā yena nadīte cubāya* – 'The conditioned soul is like a culprit who is being keelhauled in a river" does not say the conditioned soul **is** a culprit (guilty of being envious of Kṛṣṇa), but is **just like** a culprit, in the sense that he sometimes enjoys and sometimes suffers, just like a keelhauled culprit. It is a metaphor and not a literal fact.

Śrīpāda A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami writes in his commentary on Bhagavad Gītā 3.37:

"When a living entity comes in contact with the material creation, his eternal love for Kṛṣṇa is transformed into lust, in association with the mode of passion. Or, in other words, the sense of love of God becomes transformed into lust, as milk in contact with sour tamarind is transformed into yogurt."

This is not in any *śāstra* and totally contradicts the above proven point that spiritual advancement is irreversable. *Prema* is the irreversible, supreme goal of life and such a statement is a great offence against *prema*. Caitanya Caritāmṛta says:

ataeva kāma-prema bahut antara; kāma andhatama prema nirmala bhāskara

"There is a great difference between lust and *prema* - lust is deep darkness and *prema* is clear light."

And:

nitya siddha kṛṣṇa prema – "Love for Kṛṣṇa is eternally perfect." If it is eternally perfect it can thus also never be corrupted in any way.

23) THE LIVING ENTITY, AFTER FALLING DOWN FROM THE SPIRITUAL WORLD, FIRST BECOMES BRAHMĀ, AND THEN TAKES LOWER AND LOWER BIRTHS –

"Both the Lord and the living entity, being qualitatively spirit soul, have the tendency for peaceful enjoyment, but when the part of the Supreme Personality of Godhead unfortunately wants to enjoy independently, without Kṛṣṇa, he is put into the material world, where he begins his life as Brahmā and is gradually degraded to the status of an ant or a worm in stool (Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 9.24.58, Bhaktivedanta purport)."

This verse from Śrīmad-Bhāgavata (4.29.4) is sometimes quoted to prove that we fall down from the spiritual world and then start our material life as a demigod:

yadā jighṛkṣan puruṣaḥ kārtsnyena prakṛter guṇān
nava-dvāraṁ dvi-hastāṅghri tatrāmanuta sādhv iti

'When the *puruṣa* (soul) wants to grab the material modes, there it thinks 'ah, beautiful' of the (form with) nine gates, two hands and two feet."

"Originally the living entity is a spiritual being, but when he actually desires to enjoy this material world, he comes down. From this verse we can understand that the living entity first accepts a body that is human in form, but gradually, due to his degraded activities, he falls into lower forms of life — into the animal, plant and aquatic forms. By the gradual process of evolution, the living entity again attains the body of a human being and is given another chance to get out of the process of transmigration. (Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 4.29.4, Bhaktivedanta purport)

First of all, the word 'first' is not there in this verse. Secondly, the context in which this verse appears makes it clear that it is all allegorical (the Purañjana-story) and thus purely based on philosophy, not on historical facts. That means that, without any historical sequence (time-factor), the living entity generally thinks the two-armed, two-legged form is the best. That can be either a human or a *devata*-body. This is, therefore not evidence that we first become demigods (or that we fall down), nor do I know of any other evidence of this theory.

Concluding:

1. There is no scriptural evidence for the *jīvas* falling from the spiritual sky,
2. It is not supported by our *ācāryas,* nor by those of any other *sampradāya*,
3. The spiritual world would not be Vaikuṇṭha, the perfect abode,
4. nor would it be free from *māyā*

24) PURE LOVE FOR KṚṢṆA, OR THE *SIDDHA DEHA,* ARE EXTERNAL GIFTS OF THE LORD, THEY ARE NOT DORMANT WITHIN THE HEART OF THE CONDITIONED SOUL.

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami: *"When you go back to home, back to Godhead, you haven't got to accept this material body. Your spiritual body is already there within this material body. And in that spiritual body you shall exist along with God. That is the highest perfection of life."* (lecture Bhagavad-Gītā 2.11 -- Edinburgh, July 16, 1972)

"So go to God, or Kṛṣṇa, means you'll have to acquire your original, spiritual body. The spiritual body is already there, but we are now covered by this material body. So how we are eternal, that is described in the Bhagavad-gita:"

(lecture Bhagavad-gita 2.13 -- Public Lecture -- Hamburg, September 10, 1969)

However, **Śrīmad Bhāgavata (1.6.29 and 8.3.19)** say that the spiritual body is a gift by the Lord. The Bhāgavata-verse 1.6.28 starts with the word *prayujyamāna*, which means, according to Śrīdhara Swāmī and Jīva Gosvāmī, that it is *bhagavata* ***nīyamāna***, brought by the Lord. Śrīmad Bhāgavata (8.3.19) says similarly: *kiṁ cāśiṣo* ***rāty*** *api deham avyayaṁ* 'the Lord gives the imperishable body." Furthermore, Rāmānanda Raya speaks in **Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 8.222** about a *sādhaka*'s acquiring an appropriate spiritual body for serving the Lord:

vraja-lokera kona bhāva layā yei bhaje
bhāva-yogya deha ***pāiyā*** *kṛṣṇa pāya vraje*

"Whoever accepts the feelings of the residents of Vraja and engages in *bhajan* appropriate for that *bhāva,* he **receives** a body suitable for it and attains Sri Kṛṣṇa in Vraja."

Neither love of Kṛṣṇa, nor the spiritual body are dormant within the heart. Śrīmad Bhāgavata says (1.6.29):

prayujyamāne mayi tāṁ śuddhāṁ bhāgavatīṁ tanum
ārabdha-karma-nirvāṇo nyapatat pāñca-bhautikaḥ

Nārada said: "When my *prarabdha karma* was depleted, my body of five gross elements fell and the Lord brought me a transcendental body of His associate."

Śrīdhara Swāmī and Viśvanātha Cakravartīpāda comment: *yā bhāgavatī bhagavat-pārṣada-rūpā śuddhā sattva-mayī tanuḥ pratiśrutā tāṁ prati bhagavatā mayi prayujyamāne nīyamāne* – "This body is transcendental, functions as an associate of the Lord and is brought by the Lord." If it is brought by the Lord it was not dormant but an external gift.

Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī, stating the purpose of Śrī Caitanya's advent, says in his most famous verse:

anarpita-carīṁ cirāt karuṇayāvatīrṇaḥ kalau
samarpayitum unnatojjvala-rasāṁ sva-bhakti-śriyam
hariḥ puraṭa-sundara-dyuti-kadamba-sandīpitaḥ
sadā hṛdaya-kandare sphuratu vaḥ śacī-nandanaḥ

anarpita—not bestowed; carīm—having been formerly; cirāt—for a long time; karuṇayā-by causeless mercy; avatīrṇaḥ—descended; kalau—in the Age of Kali; samarpayitum—to bestow; unnata—elevated; ujjvala-rasām—the conjugal mellow; sva-bhakti—of His own service; śriyam—the treasure; hariḥ—the Supreme Lord; puraṭa—than gold; sundara—more beautiful; dyuti—of splendor; kadamba—with a multitude; sandīpitaḥ—lighted up; sadā—always; hṛdaya-kandare—in the cavity of the heart; sphuratu—let Him be manifest; vaḥ—your; śacī-nandanaḥ—the son of mother Śacī.

TRANSLATION

May the Supreme Lord who is known as the son of Śrīmatī Śacīdevī be transcendentally situated in the innermost chambers of your heart. Resplendent with the radiance of molten gold, He has appeared in the Age of Kali by His causeless mercy to bestow what no incarnation has ever offered before: the most sublime and radiant mellow of devotional service, the mellow of conjugal love.

Translation by: A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami

It is clearly written *samarpayitum* here, 'to bestow', which means the *siddha deha* is not dormant within the heart, nor is it lost from Goloka, but it is an external gift.

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami translates Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 22.107 as follows:

nitya-siddha kṛṣṇa-prema 'sadhya' kabhu naya
sravanadi-suddha-citte karaye udaya

SYNONYMS

nitya-siddha — eternally established; Kṛṣṇa-prema — love of Kṛṣṇa; sadhya — to be gained; kabhu — at any time; naya — not; śravanadi — by hearing, etc.; śuddha — purified; citte — in the heart; karaye udaya — awakens.

"Pure love for Kṛṣṇa is eternally established in the hearts of the living entities. It is not something to be gained from another source. When the heart is purified by hearing and chanting, this love naturally awakens."

Refutation: The words 'eternally established', and 'in the hearts of the living entities' are nowhere in the original Bengali text. 'it is not to be gained from another source' is also totally opposite, as it **is** gained from an external source. Caitanya Caritāmṛta (Madhya 19.151) says:

brahmāṇḍa bhramite kon bhāgyavān jīva,
guru-kṛṣṇa prasāde pāy bhakti-latā bīja.

"Wandering throughout the universe, some fortunate soul receives the seed of devotion, by the grace of Guru or Kṛṣṇa."

Every word is significant here - *kon* means "some", not that everyone gets it. *pāy* means 'he gets', not that it is intrinsic – it is coming from outside. *prasād* means that it is not deserved, but is causeless grace. One cannot work in advance to attain it. Only in this way the verse *nitya siddha kṛṣṇa-prema sādhya kabhu noy* can be understood. *hlādinī* is the missing *ānanda* in the *svarūpa* of the *jīva* and it is an external gift.

Regarding "*sādhya kabhu noy*" - The verse *nitya siddhasya bhāvasya* from the Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu (1.2.2, quoted just before the *nitya siddha kṛṣṇaprema* verse in the Caitanya Caritāmṛta) confirms this - this *nitya siddha bhāva* is the goal, it is not to be achieved artificially.

Sanskrit dictionary for *sādhya* -

साध्य	sAdhya	adj.	to be found out by calculation
साध्य	sAdhya	adj.	taking place
साध्य	sAdhya	adj.	to be set to rights
साध्य	sAdhya	adj.	attainable
साध्य	sAdhya	adj.	to be formed
साध्य	sAdhya	adj.	obtainable
साध्य	sAdhya	adj.	to be proved or demonstrated
साध्य	sAdhya	adj.	to be prepared or cooked
साध्य	sAdhya	adj.	being effected or brought about
साध्य	sAdhya	adj.	to be cultivated or perfected

BENGALI DICTIONARY - [***sādhya***] within the range of one's capability; capable of being done or accomplished or attained; curable; to be proved or deduced or inferred. n. (log.) a major term, an inference; (pop.) capability, ability. n. attainability; the range of one's ca pability; feasibility. adv. as much as one can do, to the best of one's ability.

The word *nitya siddha* means *nitya-siddha bhaktas* according to Mukunda Goswāmī in his comment on this verse (Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.2.2): *nitya-siddha-bhakteṣu śuddha-sattva-viśeṣa-rūpatayā sadā vartamānasyātra svayaṁ sphuraṇān na kṛtrimatva-śaṅkā. ataḥ śrī-kṛṣṇa-nāmādi na bhaved grāhyam indriyaiḥ (bha.ra.si. 1.2.234) iti vakṣyamāṇatvāt. sādhana-bhaktir eva na kṛtrimā, kim uta bhāvaḥ* – "The pure *sattva* which is ever present in the *nitya siddha* devotees manifests itself and thus should not be seen as artificial. This can be seen in verse 1.2.234, *ataḥ śrī kṛṣṇa nāmādi*. Surely *sādhana bhakti* is not artificial, what to speak of *bhāva.*" The words 'established in the hearts of the living entities' are not anywhere in the verse at all. *kṛṣṇa-prema* is not *sādhya* as we usually understand it, because it has no material cause. Although the word *sādhya* is also used in the case of *bhakti*, it is not in the sense of an action being performed for a specific result. For example in *karma-kāṇḍa* sacrifice is performed to go to heaven. That sacrifice is *sādhanā* and going to heaven is *sādhya* (a direct result). If one does it properly, the result is bound to come. In *Bhakti* that cause and effect relationship is not there. Although *Bhakti* is *sādhya*, it is not *sādhya* in this common sense. It is *sādhya* in the sense that it comes from the people, who have it. It appears in the heart of a *sādhaka*. *Bhakti* comes by the mercy of Kṛṣṇa and His devotees, and not because one performs certain mechanical actions. Otherwise it would not be transcendental. Since the association of saintly people is not material, the outcome also cannot be material. *Bhakti* is causeless, *yadṛcchayā*, and it is eternal, a type of consciousness or a liking to do service. This consciousness of actual liking for devotional service without any material motives and without desiring anything cannot be the result of certain physical actions. Once the liking for service has been attained, it will never turn into disliking. So *Bhakti* comes by the grace of the *nitya-siddhas*, eternally perfect devotees. The appearance of *Bhakti* in the heart is called *sādhya*.

durūhādbhuta vīrye'smin śraddhā dūre'stu pañcake
yatra sv-alpo'pi sambandhah sad-dhiyam bhāva-janmane

(Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu 1.2.238, quoted in Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 22.133)

BBT translation: "'The power of these five principles is very wonderful and difficult to understand. Even without faith in them, a person who is offenseless can awaken his dormant love of Kṛṣṇa simply by being a little connected with them.'

The translation is wrong in the last part. Even a slight contact (of these five) can give rise to *bhāva* in those who are offenseless. The key word of contention is *bhāva-janmane. janman* means birth, appearance, manifestation, coming up, rise, etc. Obviously there is no mention of dormant in the verse. Awaken also does not make sense. Moreover it is not the person who is awakening the dormant love (even if that translation is accepted) but the contact with any of these five things. So to make 'the person' as the agent of the verb 'awaken' is another mistake.

The dormant love-theory is actually the philosophy of the Sahajiyas. The word "*sahaja*" means "that, with which one is born with (innate). The term '*sahaja*' is a Sanskrit word which etymologically means 'that, one is born with' and thus it refers to the natural tendency which one possesses from birth. In the conception of divine nature, the quality to which the Sahajiyas have given prominence is the attribute of love. Maintaining that love is a natural characteristic of the Supreme being, which is possessed by man, by virtue of his origin from the Eternal Spirit. Some Baul sects, one sect of the Sahajiyas, under Vaiṣṇava influence, started their *sādhana* only with the mind - they go through a yogic process, which takes them to higher and higher states. All along the way they gradually transmute the sex-energy into the higher creative force. Eventually, the life energy is completely divinized and then it can be directed into their play with the Divine Being on the spiritual level.

In the introduction to his „Kṛṣṇa-book", A.C Bhaktivedānta Swāmi writes:

"This Kṛṣṇa katha will also be very much appealing to the most materialistic persons because Kṛṣṇa's pastimes with the gopīs, cowherd girls, are exactly like the loving affairs between young girls and boys within this material world. Actually, the sex feeling found in human society is not unnatural, because this same sex feeling is there, in the original personality of Godhead". One is pure and one is perverted. "The pleasure potency is called

Śrīmatī Rādhārāṇī, the attraction of loving affairs, on the basis of sex feeling, is the original feature of the Supreme Personality of Godhead....And we, the conditioned souls, being part and parcels of the Supreme, have such feelings also".

Which is exactly what Sahajiyas are saying.

A.C Bhaktivedānta Swāmī's commentary to Bhagavad-Gītā 3.37:

"When the living entity comes in contact with the material creation, his eternal love for Kṛṣṇa is transformed into lust. And it is the eternal love which itself becomes lust, in association with the mode of passion".

And then later on, in the same purport, A.C Bhaktivedānta Swāmī says

"Therefore, the origin of lust is also in the Supreme. If, therefore, lust is transformed into love for the Supreme, or transform into Kṛṣṇa consciousness, or, in other words, desiring everything for Kṛṣṇa, then both lust and wrath can be spiritualized".

A.C Bhaktivedānta Swāmī says in his commentary on Bhagavad-Gītā 12.9 that

"This love of God is now in dormant state, in everyone's heart, and therefore the love of God is manifested in different ways, but it is contaminated by material association".

The second last paragraph of A.C Bhaktivedānta Swāmī's comments on the very first verse of Śrīmad Bhāgavatam:

"…… Therefore sex life is not unreal. Its reality is experienced in the spiritual world. The material sex life is but a perverted reflection of the original sex. The original sex is in the Absolute Truth and thus the Absolute Truth cannot be impersonal."

Refutation - *Prema* cannot be dormant and *prema* cannot be covered. Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu has said that *prema* is the Lord's Internal potency, and the Internal potency is superior to intermediary and external (potencies). It is the intermediary energy which can be covered, for that reason only it is called intermediary. If *prema* can be covered too, then it is also intermediary. *Bhakti* is *svarūpa-śakti* and the *jīva* is

taṭastha sakti. Therefore, *bhakti* cannot be intrinsic to the *jīva. ānanda* that comes with *bhakti* is a function of *cic-chakti* which manifests as *sandhini, samvit* and *hlādinī. bhaktyānanda* is the *hlādinī*-aspect of *cic-chakti*. The Lord's *ānanda* is two-fold according to Jīva Gosvāmi's Prīti Sandarbha (66): *svarūpānanda* and *svarūpa-śaktyānanda*. The Lord Himself is depending on *svarūpa-śaktyānanda (svarūpa-śaktyānanda-rūpā yadānanda-parādhīnaḥ śrī-bhagavān apīti*). This *ānanda* is *bhakti*.

The Śruti quite clearly says that *ānanda* is not a property of the *jīva: raso vai saḥ, rasam hy evāyaṁ labdhvānandī bhavati*, "God is verily *rasa*. If one attains *rasa*, one becomes blissful". Apart from that, in the *ānandamayādhikaraṇa* of *Vedānta-sūtras*, the *ācāryas* explain that the *jīva* is not *ānandamaya*. In the *ṭīkā* to the *sūtra vikāra-śabdān neti cen na prācuryāt*, our Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa refutes the idea that the word *ānanda-maya* could be applied to the *jīva* (*tasmād ānandamayo na jīvaḥ*), and this is the case also in the liberated state which means non-existence of suffering (*na cānandamaya-śabdena muktau duḥkhāpty-asadbhāvāj jīva iti vācyam*).

In addition, commenting on the definition of the *jīva* as *cid-ānandātmaka*, Jīva Gosvāmī explains in Paramātma Sandarbha (29) that the *jīva* is not *ānanda* in the proper sense of the word: *duḥkha-pratiyogitvena tu jñānatvam ānandatvaṁ ca ... ānandatvaṁ nirupādhi-premāspadatvena sādhayati*. "Because the *jīva* is beyond misery it is said to be of the nature of consciousness and bliss ... The *jīva* attains bliss when it attains causeless love of God." However, Jīva Goswāmī mentions the *ānanda* of the *jīva* in Prīti Sandarbha (65): *ato natarāṁ jīvasya svarūpānanda-rūpā, atyanta-kṣudratvāt*. He says that it is extremely minute. However, one has to understand the statement in connection with the previous one, i.e. that the *ānanda* means just non-existence of misery.

If one argues "What about the verse *jīvera svarūpa hoy kṛṣṇera nitya-dāsa* from Caitanya Caritāmṛta (Madhya 20.108)? How to explain that in the light of *bhāva* not being inherent? The words *nitya* and *svarūpa* also imply inherence, after all."

The answer to that will be: "The verse *jīvera svarūpa hoy kṛṣṇera nitya-dāsa* does not say that *bhakti* is inherent to the *jīva*. It just means that the *jīva* is a *śakti* of the Lord, and thus it is subordinate to Him who is the *śaktimān*, the Owner of the *śakti*. This relationship is eternal. It never was and will never be different. The verses subsequent to this one in Caitanya Caritāmṛta make the point clearly. The Bhagavad Gītā statement *mad bhaktiṁ labhate paraṁ* (18.54) "He attains My devotion and thus the Supreme" proves *bhakti* is not intrinsic but gotten (*labhate*) from outside.

The translation of the word *udaya* in the *nitya siddha* verse above should not be ‘awakened’, but ‘arises’, as *prema* is not dormant in the heart.

If it were described in scripture as dormant it would have been called *supta prema* or *nidrita prema*, but such terminology does not exist at all in scripture.

The fact that *bhakti* and *prema* are said to be rare proves that they are not dormant in the heart. Otherwise they would be easily accessible to all.

25) SAHAJIYA VĀDA -

In the previous paragraph we mentioned sahajiyaism as the source of the dormant love theory. There is another example in which Bhaktivedanta spoke *sahajiya vāda* –
On November 11, 1972, in Vṛndāvana, Swāmi Bhaktivedānta said:
“There may be thousands of beautiful women before a devotee, but that does not disturb his mind. He sees:
**They are all energies of Kṛṣṇa.*
**They are gopis of Kṛṣṇa.*
**They are enjoyable by Kṛṣṇa.*
**I have to serve them. They are gopis.*
A devotee should try to engage all beautiful women in the service of Kṛṣṇa. That is his duty. Not to enjoy them. That is sense gratification. This is the position of a devotee. He is not pierced by the arrows of Cupid, but he sees everything in relationship with Kṛṣṇa, nirbandhe kṛṣṇa sambandhe yukta vairāgyam ucyate.” (BBT Folio: 721111ND.VRN)

Refutation - Mundane women are mundane women and *gopīs* are *gopīs*. Very attractive young girls in Vraja-attire can serve as an *uddīpana vibhāva*, incitements for remembering *gopīs,* but factually they are not *gopīs*. It would be an insult to compare conditioned souls in female bodies of flesh and blood to the actual *gopīs* who are Kṛṣṇa’s internal transcendental *hlādinī-śakti*. Śrīmad-bhāgavata (10.33.30) says: *naitat samācarej jātu manasāpi hyanīśvara* “Not even mentally should this Rāsa-līlā be imitated by those who are not God.”

26) FREE WILL – HOW MUCH OF IT WE REALLY HAVE?

Acyutananda – *"But in the Gita, it says, "Once coming there, he never returns. He can return?"*
A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami – *"If he likes he can return".*
Guru-kripa – "*How is it that one can become envious of Kṛṣṇa?"*

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami – *"You have got little independence, you can violate. Because you are part and parcel of God, God has got full independence, but you have got little independence, proportionately, because you are part and parcel, if he likes, he can return. That independence has to be accepted, little independence. We can misuse that. Kṛṣṇa-bahirmukha haiā bhoga vānchā kare. That misuse is the cause of our falldown".*
(Conversation, Mayapur, February 19, 1976)

Refutation - We have the innate ability to desire, but not the free will to carry out that desire. Bhakti is about purification of desire by the destruction of *avidyā* (ignorance) and *ahaṅkāra*. We don't have the free will to choose what path we go down in anything we do or experience. People take birth after birth deluded by *avidyā* and *ahankāra* until their desire is purified. Their desire shapes their actions, not by their own free will, but by the will of Paramātma in deciding what the *jīva* needs to experience to become free from aversion to God's control. Often *karma* is seen as a simple action-reaction; if you do bad you are punished. The reality is that *karma* is designed to purify the desire of the *jīva*. It's not about vengeance; it's about changing aversion to acceptance of God's control. As for free will, we need to understand what that means — it's the concept of being able to act independently of some other controlling factor. The *śāstra* is quite clear that free will is an illusion. We simply don't possess the knowledge or the ability to think or act independently.

ajño jantur anīśo'yam ātmanaḥ sukha-duḥkhayoḥ
īśvara-prerito gacchet svargaṁ vāśv abhram eva ca

"The ignorant living entity is not God – his happiness and distress are prompted by the Supreme Controller and so he goes either to heaven or hell." (Mahābhārata 3.31.27)

eṣa eva sādhu-karma kārayati taṁ yamebhyo lokebhya unninīṣate. eṣa evāsādhu karma kārayati taṁ yam adho ninīyate (Kauśitaki Upaniṣad 3.8)

"The Lord makes whomsoever he wishes to lead up from these worlds do good deeds and makes him whom he wishes to lead down from these worlds do bad deeds."

It is said in the Vedānta sūtra and Govinda Bhāṣya 2.1.34-35 –

vaiṣamya-nairghṛṇye na sāpekṣatvāt tathā hi darśayati

"There is no partiality and cruelty in the Lord, because the pleasure and pain suffered by the living beings, has regard to their *karmas* - that is shown thus by *śāstra*." (2.1.34)

na karmāvibhāgād iti cen nānāditvāt

"(The theory of *karma* cannot explain the inequality and cruelty seen in this universe, because when the creation first started) there was no distinction (of souls and consequently) of *karmas*." This (objection however) is not valid, because there is no beginning of *karma* and the mundane creation." (2.1.35)

In his Govinda Bhāṣya commentary, Baladeva quotes Bhaviṣya Purāṇa –

puṇya-pāpādikaṁ viṣṇuṁ kārayet pūrva-karmaṇā
anāditvāt karmaṇaś ca na virodhaḥ kathañcana

« Lord Viṣṇu causes the *jīvas* to engage in pious and sinful acts according to their previous *karma,* but there is no contradiction because *karmas* are beginningless. »

The idea of having no free will, of there being a destiny set in stone that cannot be altered, for everyone and the world, seems so counter-intuitive only because we are ignorant on how we function. It's not easy to come to terms with the reality of having no control, of there being a controller over everything you do and think, and of what everyone else does and thinks. When we're ready, all the truths of God's ontological presence and control in our lives is gradually revealed to us. Usually through religious philosophy, and ultimately through Vedanta.

mayādhyakṣena prakṛtiḥ sūyate sa-carācaram

"*prakṛti* (matter) works under my supervision, O son of Kunti." (Bhagavad Gītā 9.10)

prakṛtyaiva ca karmāṇi kriyamānāni sarvaśaḥ
yah paśyati tathātmānam akartāraṁ sa paśyati

"All activities taking place, in all respects, are performed by material nature. He who sees that the *ātmā* is not the doer, he sees." (Bhagavad Gītā 13.30)

na kartṛtvaṁ na karmāni lokasya sṛjati prabhuḥ
na karma-phala-saṁyogam svabhāvas tu pravartate

"The *jīva* is not the doer nor is the cause of actions, nor is he connected to the reactions from actions (not the controller, doing or doer), nevertheless they take place because of the nature of the *jīva*." (Bhagavad-Gītā 5.14)

Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravarti comments - *nāpi tat-kartṛtvena karmāṇy api, na ca karma-phalair bhogaiḥ saṁyogam api, kintu jīvasya svabhāvo'nādy-avidyaiva pravartate. taṁ jīvaṁ kartṛtvādy-abhimānam ārohayitum iti bhāvaḥ*

"He does not make the *jīva* do activities nor does He give the *jīva* the results of his activities. Rather the nature of the *jīva* in the form of his beginningless ignorance alone produces this. That ignorance makes the *jīva* assume the false identification as the doer."

The statement "*yathecchasi tathā kuru*" ("Whatever you like, you can do") in Bhagavad-Gītā 18.63 does not indicate free will. The Lord has already told Arjuna to act according to his *adhikāra* and *svabhāva*, 3 verses earlier. Therefore, the statement means, he must understand his *adhikāra* and act according to that *adhikāra*. The *ṭīkā* of Rāmānujācārya is very clear. He says *etad aśeṣeṇa vimṛśya* ***svādhikārānurūpaṁ*** *yathā icchasi tathā kuru* - 'Act as you wish **according to your *adhikāra***'. Madhusūdana Saraswati comments: ***svādhikārānurūpyeṇa yathecchasi tathā kuru*** *na tv etad avimṛśyaiva kāma-kāreṇa yat kiṁcid ity arthaḥ* "**Do as you wish according to your *adhikāra*** but not that you act rashly and according to your own desires!!!!*"*

If he does not, he will suffer and that too has been pointed out in previous verses –

svabhāva-jena kaunteya nibaddhah svena karmana
kartuṁ necchasi yan mohāt kariṣyasy avaśo'pi tat

"Out of illusion you do not wish to act, but due to your nature which binds you to your actions you will act helplessly anyway." (Bhagavad-Gītā 18.60)

īśvaraḥ sarva-bhūtanam hṛd-dese'rjuna tiṣṭhati
bhrāmayan sarva-bhūtāni yantrārūḍhāni māyayā

“The supreme controller is in the heart of all beings Arjuna, prompting the movements of all living beings, who are mounted on the machine of his deluding potency.” (Bhagavad Gītā 18.61)

Free will seems another Christian insertion into Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava philosophy so popular with western rationalists. There is *anādi karma* (Vedānta-sūtra 2.1.35) and there is no question of free will when there is *anādi-karma*. The entry into *bhakti* is not due to free will.

As to Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa's *ṭīkā* to Bhagavad Gītā 18.14, there is a difference between free will and agency or being the doer of things (*kartṛtva*). If being the doer is not there, scriptural statements will become meaningless. The will of the *jīva* is not beyond its *svarūpa*. This is said in Brahma-sūtra 2.3.39.

kārya-kāraṇa-kartṛtve hetuḥ prakṛtir ucyate
puruṣaḥ sukha-duḥkhānāṁ bhoktṛtve hetur ucyate

“Material nature is said to be the cause of all material activities and phenomena, while the living entity is the cause of its happiness and distress.” (Bhagavad-Gītā 13.20)

The line *puruṣaḥ sukha-duḥkhānāṁ bhoktṛtve hetur ucyate* in this verse does not refer to free will, as the results of activities are prompted by Bhagavan or the *jīvas' svabhāva*. Vedānta Sūtra 2.3.39 and 40 says –

parāt tu tacchruteḥ

“Activities of the living beings come from (are prompted by) the Supreme. The scriptures declare it so.”

kṛta prayatnāpekṣas tu vihita pratiṣiddha avaiyarthyādibhyaḥ

“The Lord makes the soul act and the results are accordingly, so that injunctions and prohibitions of the scriptures may not become meaningless.”

The *jīvātma* has *kartṛtva* (power to act), but that *kartṛtva* is granted by God only. It is limited *kartṛtva*. An object in darkness cannot get into the sunlight unless the sunlight falls on it. Free will is like the will to see. The eyes can see - that much capacity is there. But the eyes can see only that which is within its field of vision. If

the eyes are in darkness, they can only see darkness. They cannot see light. Bhagavān prompts the *jīva* according to his *svabhāva, karma, saṁskāras* etc. The *jīva* always has the capacity to will, feel and act, but what he wills, feels and does is restricted by his own *karma, svabhāva* and the Lord's sanctions. By free will, one who is under *bahiraṅgā-śakti* cannot come under *antaraṅga* and vice-versa. His free will under *bahiraṅga śakti* is restricted to acting within *bahiraṅgā śakti*.

Sanātan Goswāmī says there is freedom for the *siddhas* in Vaikuṇṭha, but that is freedom compared to this material world - freedom from the *bahiraṅgā śakti*, but not freedom to leave/fall from Vaikuṇṭha. The *jīva* is then under the *antarāṅgā-śakti* and it will be impossible for him to fall. The *mamatva* (possessiveness) has changed from a dead body to *parama-saccidānanda-vastu*. It will be impossible for *mamatva* to change again. *siddhi* is *siddhi* - otherwise it is not *siddhi* - perfection.

Therefore, the *jīva*'s free will is within the limits of his freedom as granted by *īśvara* and is bound by his own *karma.* If minute independence is not there, then the *jīva* would become like *jaḍa* (dead matter). Then all scriptural injunctions will become useless and the defect of not following them will come to the Lord. But that independence is no way called free will. That is not there in the *jīva's svarūpa*. It is a dependent independence. Like a bird able to fly inside a zoo. And the bird is a turkey or a hen. Not a peacock, eagle or dove.

27) ONE CANNOT FALL DOWN FROM BRAHMAN

Brahma-bhūta living entities are allowed to stay in Brahmaloka or Siddhaloka, but unfortunately they sometimes again fall into the material world because they are not engaged in devotional service. This is supported by Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (10.2.32): ye 'nye 'ravindākṣa. These semi-liberated souls falsely claim to be liberated, but unless one engages in devotional service to the Lord, he is still materially contaminated. Therefore these living entities have been described as vimukta-māninaḥ, meaning that they falsely consider themselves liberated although their intelligence is not yet purified. Although these living entities undergo severe austerities to rise to the platform of Siddhaloka, they cannot remain there perpetually, for they are bereft of ānanda (bliss). Even though these living entities attain the brahma-bhūta stage and realize the Supreme Personality of Godhead through His bodily effulgence, they nonetheless fall down due to neglecting the Lord's service. They do not properly utilize whatever little knowledge they have of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Not attaining ānanda, or bliss, they come down to the material world to enjoy.

This is certainly a falldown for one who is actually liberated. The bhaktas consider such a falldown equal to achieving a place in hell."

(A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami purport to Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Madhya 6.269)

Refutation - Śrīdhara Svāmī comments on Śrīmad Bhāgavata 10.2.32:

kṛcchrena bahu janma tapasā paraṁ padaṁ mokṣa sannihitaṁ sat-kula tapaḥ śrutādi -"After many births of penance he attains the supreme abode, nearness to liberation, birth in a good family, learning..." '*sannihita*' means "close, near, at hand, proximate, prepared to, ready or", so he's not really merged in *brahman* yet and thus cannot fall down from it either.

Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī explains this 10.2.32-verse as follows in Bhakti-sandarbha (111) *- kṛcchreṇa paraṁ padaṁ jīvan-mukti-rūpām āruhya prāpyāpi* – "With great penance they ascended to the accomplishment of *jīvan-mukti' jīvan-mukti* means liberated, but still in the body. After all, a merged soul cannot offend anyone.

28) SVARŪPA IS NOT A FORM

SB 4.29.65, Purport - *"If the mind is purified by Kṛṣṇa consciousness, one will naturally in the future get a body that is spiritual and full of Kṛṣṇa consciousness. Such a body is our original form, as Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu confirms, jīvera 'svarūpa' haya-kṛṣṇera 'nitya-dāsa': (CC Madhya 20.108) "Every living entity is constitutionally an eternal servant of Kṛṣṇa." If a person is engaged in the devotional service of the Lord, he is to be considered a liberated soul even in this life."*

Refutation: The word *svarūpa* in Sanskrit can mean one's own form (*sva-rūpa*), or nature. The first meaning is not applicable because atma is *aṇu* (atomic). Besides, it cannot mean form here, because it is ridiculous to say that the form of a *jīva* is to be eternal servant. It is not that some particular form can be servant and others not. Rather, it is the nature of the *jīva* to be servant because one's nature can be of servant or not servant. In Paramatma Sandarbha, Anuccheda 19, the *jīva* is listed there as *aṇu* (atomic). *Aṇu* in indian philosophy is the minutest particle which is formless and indivisible. *Aṇu* has no parts and thus it is indivisible. A partless object cannot have form. That is why Kṛṣṇa says in the Gītā that *ātma* is *avyakta* and *acintya*. Therefore *svarūpa* here means nature.

29) THE *JĪVA* IS NOT A PART OF BRAHMAN, BUT OF PARAMĀTMĀ:

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami in Śri Īśopanisad, 16, Purport –

"The all-pervading feature of the Lord -which exists in all circumstances of waking and sleeping as well as in potential states and from which the jīva-śakti (living force) is generated as both conditioned and liberated souls - is known as Brahman."

Refutation – in Paramātmā Sandarbha (19), Jīva Gosvāmī quotes the sage Śrī Jāmāṭṛ Muni (1370-1443), a follower of Rāmānujācārya and popularly known as Varavara Muni:

tathā jñātṛtva-kartṛtva-bhoktṛtva-nija-dharmakaḥ
paramātmaika-śeṣatva-svabhāvaḥ sarvadā svataḥ

"The *jīva* has the characteristics of knowership, agency and enjoyership; it is **naturally always the part of the Paramātmā**."

Jīva Gosvāmī further quotes the Śrutis which confirm that the *jīva* is Part of Paramātmā because they are His potency (Paramātma Sandarbha 39):

sva-kṛta-pureṣv amīṣv abahir-antar-asaṁvaraṇaṁ
tava puruṣaṁ vadanty akhila-śakti-dhṛto'ṁśa-kṛtam (10.87.20)

30) ARE SINS COMMITTED IN IGNORANCE PUNISHED?

"Those who are not in knowledge, who commit violations of the standard laws, are subject to be punished under criminal laws. Similarly, the laws of nature are very stringent. If a child touches fire without knowing the effect, he must be burned, even though he is only a child. If a child violates the law of nature, there is no compassion. Only through ignorance does a person violate the laws of nature, and when he comes to knowledge he does not commit any more sinful acts."

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami commentary on Śrīmad Bhāgavat 4.26.34

Refutation: This is a material example. Śrīdhara Swāmī comments on Śrīmad Bhāgavat 11.21.17:

doṣasya kvacid doṣatvābhāve guṇatve codāharaṇaṁ darśayati. samānasya tasyaiva karmaṇaḥ surā-pānāder ācaraṇam apatitānāṁ patana-hetur api jātyā karmaṇā vā

patitānāṁ punaḥ pātakam adhikāra-bhraṁśakaṁ na bhavati, pūrvam eva patitatvāt . ato'tra doṣasyāpi doṣatā nāstīty arthaḥ

'One man's fault is another man's virtue or at least lack of fault. It is the same act (*samāna karma*), but if an *apatita (brāhmaṇa* or Vaiṣṇava) drinks alcohol, it is the cause of his/her falldown, but for those anyway fallen (*śūdras* or non-devotees) this does not cause further degradation because it is their normal way to be. Thus, though it is a flaw (for some) there is no flaw."

In the Manu Saṁhitā (8.337-8) it is said:

aṣṭāpādyaṁ tu śūdrasya steye bhavati kilbiṣam
ṣodaśaiva tu vaiśyasya dvātriṁśat kṣatriyasya ca
brāhmaṇasya catuḥ ṣaṣṭiḥ pūrṇaṁ vāpi śataṁ bhavet
dviguṇā vā catuḥ ṣaṣṭis tad doṣa guṇa vid hi saḥ

"In (a case of) theft the guilt of a *śūdra* shall be eightfold, that of a *vaiśya* sixteen-fold, that of a *kṣatriya* thirty-twofold, that of a Brahmana sixty-fourfold, or quite a hundredfold, or (even) twice four-and-sixtyfold; (each of them) knowing the nature of the offence."

And that is even in the Vedic system, let alone for the ignorant non-Hindus.

MINOR ISSUES

31) *gṛhasthas* should not wear a ***KAUPĪNA,*** and this is also not '*brāhmaṇa*-underwear'. A *kaupīna* is traditionally given during the ceremony of *sannyāsa* for a lifelong vow of celibacy. Śrīnivāsācārya says in the Ṣaḍ-gosvāmyaṣṭakam (4) - *tyaktvā tūrṇam aśeṣa-maṇḍala-pati-śreṇīṁ sadā tucchavat…. kaupīna-kanthāśritau* 'Having given up the company of the rich and powerful as insignificant….they took shelter of loincloths and ragged quilts.' Thus a *kaupīna* hardly seems underwear for a householder….

32) ATONEMENT FOR BREAKING EKĀDAŚĪ –

January 13, 1976 - Calcutta

"Because it was Ekadasi we skipped breakfast and fasted until noon. But at lunchtime the devotees inadvertently broke the Ekadasi vow because the cook accidentally

put peas into the vegetables…..Shamefaced, Tamal Krishna Maharaja went to Prabhupada to report what had happened and to find out what should be done. Srila Prabhupada told us we were all nonsense. He angrily rebuked us, "Now you have to fast for three days!" This shocked everyone. "Yes, that is the procedure," he confirmed. Seeing the stunned look on our faces, he relented but said that we should observe Ekadasi for the rest of the day and then again tomorrow on Dvadasi. - Hari-śauri dās, Transcendental Diary, 1.258

Refutation - Actually, there is no atonement for the breaking of Ekādaśī, as Lord Nārāyaṇa gave the *pāpa puruṣa*, embodiment of sin, his residence in food grains on Ekādaśī alone -

śrī-bhagavān uvāca—
uttiṣṭha pāpapuruṣa tyaja śokaṁ mudaṁ kuru
ekādaśyāṁ tithau yatra tava sthānaṁ vadāmi te

The Lord spoke: "Rise O *pāpa puruṣa*! Give up your sorrow and rejoice! I am telling you that the lunar day of Ekādaśī will be your abode." (Padma Purāṇa, Kriyā kaṇḍa, 22.45). There is no rule in *śāstra* that one should fast again on a later day to atone for eating grains on Ekādaśī. In fact there is no atonement system at all in *bhakti mārga* – *hari sthāne aparādha tabe harināma* (Narottama) "If an offence to Lord Hari is committed *harināma* is the atonement."

33) THE *GURU-PARAMPARĀ* IS PLACED IN THE WRONG ORDER ON ISKCON-ALTARS.

The Guru is seated on the disciple's right side at the time of initiation and remains there eternally. On ISKCON-altars the Guru is on the left of the disciple. In Vedic culture the superior is on the right and the subordinate on the left.

śrīdāma subalau vāme puro'sya madhumangalaḥ
***dakṣiṇe śrī balas**cānye paritaḥ samupāviśan*

(Govinda Līlāmṛta 4.22)

"(During Kṛṣṇa's breakfast) Śrīdāma and Subala sat on Kṛṣṇa's left, Madhumangala faced Him and **Balarāma sat on His right**……."

Balarāma, the superior, sits on the right, and Śrīdāma and Subala, His subordinates, on the left.

dakṣiṇe'syāgrajau *vāme'nujau putrau puraḥ sthitau;*
subhadrādyā harer vāme ***baṭavo bala dakṣiṇe***

(Govinda Līlāmṛta 20.44)

(During supper) "Nanda's older brothers (Upananda and Abhinanda) sat on his right, his younger brothers (Sananda and Nandana) on his left and Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma faced him. Subhadra and others sat on Kṛṣṇa's left and the *brāhmaṇas* sat on Balarāma's right."

34) COOKING AND SERVING *PRASĀDA*

are services for the oldest and most mature devotees, not for the youngest and least mature devotees, because they are not yet pure enough, either physically or spiritually. The purity of the donor, server, cook – everything everything goes into the consciousness of the eater. The older devotees may be too proud or too lazy to do this, or may consider it 'menial service', but it isn't. Śrīdhara Svāmī comments on Bhagavad Gītā 9.26 (the famous verse *patraṁ puṣpaṁ phalaṁ toyam..) prayatātmanaḥ śuddha-cittasya niṣkāma-bhaktasya tat-patra-puṣpādikaṁ bhaktyā tena upahṛtaṁ samarpitam aham aśnāmi* "The word *prayatātmanaḥ* means a devotee who is purehearted and free from desires. I eat such a devotee's offering." Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī comments on this verse: *kiṁ ca mad-bhaktasyāpy apavitra-śarīratve sati nāśnāmīty āha prayatātmanaḥ śuddha-śarīrasyeti rajaḥsvalādayo vyāvṛttāḥ* – "(Kṛṣṇa says: " I will not eat even from My devotees if their bodies are impure. *prayatātmanaḥ* means with a pure body, not polluted by menstruation and so." A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami, both in his verse-translation, ("If one offers Me with love and devotion a leaf, a flower, fruit or water, I will accept it.") and his purport of the verse, fails to mention this important point.

There is much evidence in Śrīman Mahāprabhu's pastimes that only the seniormost devotees served *prasāda* –

Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Antya 11.84:

svarūpa, jagadānanda, kāśīśvara, śaṅkara; cāri-jana pariveśana kare nirantara

"Svarūpa Dāmodara, Jagadānanda Paṇḍit, Kāśīśvara Paṇḍit, Śaṅkara Pandit – these four devotees always served *prasāda.*"

Śrī Swarūp Dāmodara was probably Śrīman Mahāprabhu's closest associate and was His secretary as well.

Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Antya 7.68:

svarūpa, jagadānanda, kāśīśvara, śaṅkara; pariveśana kare, āra rāghava, dāmodara

"Svarūpa Dāmodara, Jagadānanda Paṇḍit, Kāśīśvara Paṇḍit, Śaṅkara Pandit, as well as Rāghava Pandit and Dāmodar Pandit served *prasāda*."

Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Madhya 12.163-4:

svarūpa-gosāi, jagadānanda, dāmodara; kāśīśvara, gopīnātha, vāṇīnātha, śaṅkara
pariveśana kare tāhāṅ ei sāta-jana; madhye madhye hari-dhvani kare bhakta-gaṇa

"Svarūpa Dāmodara Gosvāmī, Jagadānanda Pandit, Dāmodar Paṇḍita, Kāśīśvara, Gopīnātha, Vāṇīnātha and Śaṅkara – these seven personalities distributed *prasāda*, and inbetween the devotees chanted the holy names of Hari."

Śrīman Mahāprabhu Himself served the viraha-feast for Haridās Thākur –

sabāre bosāilā prabhu yogya krama kari'; śrī-haste pariveśana koilo gaurahari

"One after the other, Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu made all the devotees sit in their proper places. He then began to distribute *prasāda* with His own divine hand." Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Madhya 11.199

Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Madhya 3.67 –

prabhu bale — boso tine koriye bhojana; ācārya kahe — āmi koribo pariveśana

Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu said, "Let Us sit down in these three places, and We shall take prasādam." However, Advaita Ācārya said, "I shall distribute the *prasāda*."

One should not think that '*prasāda* can never be contaminated'- Raghunātha Dāsa Goswāmī invited Śrīman Mahāprabhu with *mahāprasāda* from Lord Jagannātha, bought with the money from his father, who was called '*vaiṣṇava prāya'*, almost a Vaiṣṇava, by Mahāprabhu, and thus Mahāprabhu proclaimed –

viṣayīra anna khāile molin hoy mana; molin mana hoilo nahe kṛṣṇera smaraṇa

(Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Antya 6.278)

"When one eats grains from a sensual person, the mind is polluted, and when the mind is polluted one cannot remember Kṛṣṇa."

On the other hand, when Śrīmatī Rādhikā served *prasāda* to Kṛṣṇa, Raghunātha Dās Goswāmī said *'rasa sancayaṁ kramāt'* – She infused *rasa* into the food, *prema rasa.* (Vilāpa Kusumānjali – 63)

35) ONE DOES NOT OFFER FIRST TO THE GURU AND THEN TO KṚṢṆA.

"For offering prasadam simply prayers to the Spiritual Master is sufficient. The process is that everything is offered to the Spiritual Master, and the Spiritual Master is supposed to offer the same foodstuff to the Lord. Therefore simply by chanting the prayer to the Spiritual Master, everything will be complete."

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami, Letter to Harer Nama, May 28, 1968

Refutation: Viṣṇu tattva does not get *prasāda* from *jīva tattva*. The argument that "The Guru offers for me because I am not qualified" is not valid. One must personally offer. It is between each individual *jīva* and God. The practise of letting the Guru offer one's food because one is not qualified is not in any scripture like Hari-bhakti Vilāsa (where offerings to the deities are described and prescribed from 8.96-202). There would be no need for *sādhana* and no meaning to the concept of *sādhaka* if we would let the Guru do our service for us. Śrī Kṛṣṇa says Śrīmad Bhāgavata

(11.11.40): *api dīpāvalokaṁ me nopayuñjyān niveditam* "…one should not even offer Me a lamp already offered (to others)…"

On ISKCON-altars items are first offered to Guru and then to the Lord, but during Tulasī-*ārati* items are first offered to Tulasī and then to the Guru and that makes no sense at all.

36) LORD BALARĀMA'S BIRTHDAY

is observed in ISKCON with a fast or an Ekādaśī feast, while actually Balarāma is not at all a Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava *upāsya* (worshipable deity). This *vrata* or *utsava* for Śrī Balarāma's birthday is not observed by any Vaiṣṇava group, apart from villagers in Dauji village or the *bhaktas* of Gaura Dauji in Vṛndāvana, Mathura Road, neither of whom are Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas, nor is it mentioned in any *śāstra* like Haribhakti Vilāsa or Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu. We are devotees of Kṛṣṇa, not of Balarāma. No fast is required or prescribed for it. Śrīnātha Cakravartī, the disciple of Advaita Ācārya, in his famous verse, wrote: ***ārādhyo bhagavān vrajeśa-tanyas tad dhāma vṛndāvanam*** "The worshipable deity is Kṛṣṇa, the son of Nanda Maharaja, who lives in Vṛndāvana." *ramya kācid upāsana vrajavadhū-vargena* "He is to be worshipped as the *gopīs* did." *śrī caitanya mahāprabhor matam idam* "**This is the opinion of Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu**." One should meditate on Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa 365 days a year, including the appearance days of Rāma, Nṛsiṁha, Gaura, Vāmana etc. The birthday of Balarāma, on Śrāvaṇa Pūrṇimā, is also not correct. Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī writes in his Gopāla Campūḥ (3.86):

atha yogamāyā rohiṇyāḥ sāptamāsikaṁ garbhaṁ srastaṁ vidhāya devakyās tad-vidhaṁ taṁ tasyāṁ niyojayāmāsa. tataś ca labdha-sarva-samaya-sampad-daśe caturdaśe māsi ***śrāvaṇataḥ prāk*** *śravaṇa-rkṣe samasta-sukha-rohiṇī rohiṇī guṇa-gaṇanayā suṣamaṁ sita-suṣamaṁ sutaṁ susrāva*

"Yogamāyā then stopped the creation of the seventh month embryo in Rohiṇī's womb and transferred the seventh month embryo from Devakī's womb. After the fourteenth month of pregnancy, at a most auspicious time, **before Śrāvaṇa-month**, during Śravaṇa-constellation, Rohiṇī, in great joy gave birth to a most beautiful son endowed with all qualities. "

37) 'NITYĀNANDA PRABHU IS THE ORIGINAL GURU' is not confirmed in any *śāstra*.

“Lord Nityānanda, who is Balarāma Himself, the first direct manifestation or expansion of Kṛṣṇa, is the original spiritual master. “

– A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami, Caitanya Caritāmṛta Ādi 1, 44 purport

Rather, Kṛṣṇa is called the Ādi Guru or *jagat-guru* all over Śrīmad Bhāgavata (1.8.25, 8.24.46-48, 10.16.26, 10.23.42, 10.46.30, 10.80.11 and 10.90.27). The concept of Nityānanda being *ādi guru* may originate from Bhaktivinoda, who was initiated in the line of Nityānanda Prabhu. So that counts just for him, but not for all Vaiṣṇavas.

38) THE FOUR REGULATIVE PRINCIPLES-

“As already explained, one should not be idle but should be very enthusiastic about executing the regulative principles -- tat-tat-karma-pravartana. ***Neglect of the regulative principles will destroy devotional service.*** *In this Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement there are four basic regulative principles, forbidding illicit sex, meat-eating, gambling and intoxication. A devotee must be very enthusiastic about following these principles. If he becomes slack in following any of them, his progress will certainly be checked.”*

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami “ Nectar of instruction” verse 3

THE FOUR REGULATIVE PRINCIPLES, however virtuous and necessary, are themselves **NOT** devotional service – the regulative principles of cleanliness, chastity, compassion, study, austerity etc., have been classified as *saṅga siddha bhakti*, or 'associated items of devotion', in Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī's Bhakti Sandarbha (217). Śrī Jīva quotes Śrīmad Bhāgavata 11.3.23-24, verses that provide a long list of qualities: *saṅga-siddhā* ***svato bhaktitvābhāve’pi*** *tat-parikaratayā saṁsthāpanena tatra bhāgavatān dharmān śikṣed gurvātmadaivataḥ (BhP 11.3.24) ityādi-prakaraṇeṣu sarvato manaso’saṅgam (BhP 11.3.23)* - *"saṅga siddha bhakti*, with all its virtuous qualities, **is not intrinsically devotional in itself**, but establishes devotion through association."

39) BEATING WOMEN

It is often quoted in ISKCON (by A.C. Bhaktivedānta Swami in New York, April 12, 1969 and Bombay, April 19, 1977) from Goswami Tulsidas' "Rāma-carit-manas":

dol gavār śūdra paśu nārī
sakal tāḍanā ke adhikārī

"A drum, a village boor, a *śūdra*, an animal and a woman are all fit subjects for beating. (Sundar Kand 59)."

Refutation: This is not a Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava scripture. The Śrīmad Bhāgavata **is** a Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava scripture, though. There, in verse 4.17.20, it is said:

praharanti na vai strīṣu kṛtāgaḥsvapi jantavaḥ

"People do not beat women, even if they have done wrong. "

40) ARE WOMEN LESS INTELLIGENT?

Śrīmad Bhāgavata, 4.4.3, narrates:

tato viniḥśvasya satī vihāya taṁ śokena roṣeṇa ca dūyatā hṛdā
pitror agāt ***straiṇa-vimūḍha-dhīr*** *gṛhān premṇātmano yo 'rdham adāt satāṁ priyaḥ*

A.C. Bhaktivedānta Swami's translation: "Thereafter Satī left her husband, Lord Śiva, who had given her half his body due to affection. Breathing very heavily because of anger and bereavement, she went to the house of her father. **This less intelligent act** was due to her being a weak woman."

Refutation: The *ācāryas* (Viśvanātha Cakravartī and Śrīdhara Swāmi) comment: *straiṇaṁ strī-svabhāvas tena vimūḍhā dhīr yasyāḥ* - 'Her intelligence was deluded by her feminine nature' So the intelligence is there, but it is temporarily covered by typical feminine emotions.

41) THE GURU MINGLING IN THE DISCIPLES' INTIMATE LIVES -

N.B. I am also in receipt of your letters dated October 20 & 21, 1975. I note that your wife and Visalaini both gave birth to baby girls. That is the defect. ***I want male children but you have no stamina for it.*** *I expected from Visalaini by her belly that it would be a boy. Anyway, never mind. The name Brijlata is nice. Why do the majority of my married disciples give birth to girls?*

(Letter to: Dhananjaya: Bombay 9 November, 1975)

A.C Bhaktivedanta Swami's translation of Śrīmad Bhāgavata 7.12.11:

"The gṛhastha, however, is given permission by the spiritual master to indulge in sex during the period favorable for procreation."

Refutation: That is not a correct translation of that verse. The text says *guru vṛttir vikalpena gṛhasthasyartu gāmināḥ*. The word *vṛtti* means: turning, rolling; being, existence, livelihood, maintenance; mode of being or acting, conduct, **behaviour, esp. good conduct or respectful behaviour towards; devotion to or pursuit of;** usage, practice, rule; nature, character, style (d.); action, activity, function or force of a word; commentary on a Sūtra. (Monier Williams)

And *vikalpa* means: alternative, choice between two or more; difference, variety; supposition, (false) conception; uncertainty, doubt. (Monier-Williams).

Neither word means 'permission'. *guru vṛttir vikalpena* means 'the service of the Guru is optional for the *gṛhastha*, who is *ṛtu-gāmī*, approaching the wife in her season. At that time Guru-service is not possible. The context of the sentence is the *brahmacārī*'s duty of serving the Guru, which may not be possible for the *gṛhastha*, who usually does not live with the Guru. Śrīdhara Swāmi, Jīva Gosvāmī and Viśvanātha Cakravartī have not commented on this sentence, but both the English translation of Gita-Press and the Hindi translation of Krishna Shankar Shastri say so. The above explanation has also been given by Ācārya Vīra-Rāghava: *gurvī vṛttir gurvānuvṛttiḥ strī-saṅga rāhityādi rūpā brahmacarya vṛttiḥ gṛhasthasya tu vikalpena kadācid bhavet kadācin na syāt. kadā na bhavet? ……ṛtu-gāmina iti. ṛtu gāmitvād guru vṛtti vikalpa iti bhāvaḥ. ṛtu-kāleṣu guru vṛttir nāstīti ca bhāvaḥ. asyā vṛttir duṣkaratvābhiprāyeṇa gurviti viśeṣaṇam upāttam*. "The *brahmacārī* does not associate with women, so he can constantly serve the Guru, but that is not so for the *gṛhastha*, who can sometimes do and sometimes not do this service. When can he not do? ……. When he approaches his wife in the season. Then Guru service becomes an option. In the seasonal time the Guru is not served, for it will be difficult to accomplish."

The point is that is not an item of Vedic culture that the Guru tells the disciple when to make a baby or that he mingles in the private lives of his disciples, period.

42) IT IS NOT ALLOWED TO GIVE *DĪKṢĀ* WHILE ONE'S GURU IS STILL ALIVE?

"So far as your taking initiation from Brahmananda Maharaja, I have no objection, but it is the etiquette that in the presence of one's Spiritual Master, one does not accept disciples. In this connection, Swami Brahmananda may write me and I will instruct him."

-- A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami - Letter to John Milner, March 24, 1971

Refutation: Yadunandana-ācārya initiated Raghunātha dāsa Gosvāmī when Raghunātha Dāsa was still at home, and later Dās Gosvāmī even met with Advaita-ācārya, who is Yadunandana's guru. Advaita-ācārya > Yadunandan-ācārya > Raghunātha dāsa Gosvāmī. Raghunātha later meets with Advaita in Puri. Antya-līlā, chapter 6, 242, "When Raghunātha dāsa met them all, Advaita-ācārya was very kind to him". Antya 6 verses 158 - 161, make clear Yadunandan is guru of Raghunātha Dās Gosvāmī previously.

vāsudeva-dattera teṅha haya ‘anugṛhīta’
raghunāthera ‘guru’ teṅho haya ‘purohita’ Antya 6.161

“Yadunandana Ācārya was the priest and Guru of Raghunātha dāsa. He had accepted the mercy of Vāsudeva Datta.”
Then

raghunātha-dāsa yabe sabāre mililā
advaita-ācārya tāṅre bahu kṛpā kailā Antya 6.245

“When Raghunātha dāsa met all the devotees (in Puri, later), Advaita Ācārya showed him great mercy.”

Śyāmānanda prabhu was deputed to Orissa for preaching. In a village called Rohiṇī on the banks of the river Subarnarekhā, the village chieftain Acyuta and his son Rasikānanda became the disciples of Śyāmānanda prabhu. One day the news arrived that Hṛdaya-Caitanya had passed away. Shortly after that, Śyāmānanda prabhu installed Śrī Rasikānanda as the Mahānta of the Śrīpāṭa. Confirmed in Śrī Rasika Mangala. Rasikānanda had long ago received *dīkṣā* from Śyāmānanda Prabhu. Hṛdaya Caitanya (Hṛdayānanda, same person confirmed by text also) passed away later. Western division, 13th wave tells of Hṛdayānanda’s passing. Southern Division, 1st Wave tells of Rasikananda's *dīkṣā*, which is before the Western Division.

43) LORD JAGANNĀTHA IN VAIKUṆṬHA

Regarding your questions, there is no special planet for the Lord in His form of Lord Jagannatha. This particular lila was performed with His brother and sister when They were on this planet. If you are attracted to worshiping this form of the Lord, then you will go to Krishna. Lord Jagannatha is Krishna.

75-01-09 letter to Devamāyā devi dasi, London.

Correction: Sanātana Goswāmī's Bṛhad Bhāgavatāmṛta (2.5.209) –

> *kintūpadeśāṁ hitam ekam etaṁ mattaḥ śṛṇu śrī-puruṣottamākhyam |*
> *kṣetraṁ tad atrāpi vibhāty adūre pūrvaṁ tvayā yad bhuvi dṛṣṭam asti*

Śrī Nārada Muni to Gopa-kumāra, "Please hear from me this one instruction: Not far from here (Vaikuṇṭha) a place named Srī Puruṣottama- kṣetra is splendidly manifested. This is the same place you saw before on the earth. The transcendental abode of Lord Jagannatha on earth is also present in Vaikuṇṭha."
Sanātana Goswāmī comments: *yat tvayā pūrvaṁ bhuvi pṛthivyāṁ dṛṣṭam asti tat puruṣottamākhyaṁ śrī kṣetram. atra śrī vaikuṇṭhaloke'pyadūre vibhāti. evaṁ martyalokavarti tat-kṣetrasya śrī vaikuṇṭhavartinā tenaiva sāmyam uktam* "What you have seen before on earth, is the holy field called Puruṣottama. This is not far from Śrī Vaikuṇṭha. In this way the Puruṣottama-kṣetra in this mortal world is said to be the same as the one situated in Śrī Vaikuṇṭha."

44) WHO WROTE THE ĀRĀDHYO BHAGAVĀN VERSE?

"Caitanya Mahaprabhu says... Caitanya Mahaprabhu's philosophy, it is said by Visvanatha Cakravarti, aradhyo bhagavan vrajesa-tanaya tad-dhama vrndavanam. Vrajesa-tanaya, Vrajendra-nandana Hari, Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇa is very much pleased when He is addressed as Vrajendra-nandana, Yasodanandana,…."

A.C. Bhaktivedanta. Srimad Bhagavat 1.7.40 class Vrindavan October 1, 1976

"Caitanya Mahaprabhu's philosophy is like that, which is explained by Srila Visvanatha Cakravarti Thakura: prema pumartho mahan aradhyo bhagavan vrajesa tanayas tad-dhama vrndavanam."

A.C. Bhaktivedanta, Calcutta, January 29, 1973

Correction: This text, however, is the opening text of Śrīnāth Cakravarti (a disciple of Adwaita Prabhu and the Guru of Kavi Karnapur)'s commentary on Śrīmad Bhāgavat, named 'Caitanya Mata Manjuṣā'.

45) DEITIES NAMES LIKE RĀDHĀ-LONDON-ĪŚVARA, RĀDHĀ-PARIS-ĪŚVARA AND RĀDHĀ-PĀRTHA SĀRATHI

The holy names of the Lord are mentioned in *śāstra* and are non different from Him.

a) London and Paris are not among these names. Śrīla Jīva Goswāmī writes: *atra yaiḥ śāstre'tiprasiddhaiḥ śrī-bhagavān eva jhaṭiti pratīto bhavati, yeṣāṁ ca sāṅkety-ādāv api tādṛśa-prabhāvaḥ śrūyate, teṣāṁ svataḥ-siddhatvam, anyeṣāṁ kalpanā-mayatvaṁ jñeyam* (Bhagavat Sandarbha 35): "These self-existent names constitute the Vedas, transcend all material names and their corresponding objects, and are imperceptible by any means of acquiring knowledge. Thus, the Lord is not glorified by manufactured names. Only transcendental names with the above characteristics can manifest the Lord's glory."

Śrīmad-bhāgavata (12.4.31) says that even a *laukika* name can refer to the Supreme Lord –

evaṁ vacobhir bhagavān adhokṣajo vyākhyāyate laukika-vaidikair janaiḥ

"The Lord who is inaccessible to material senses, is described in various terms, **both ordinary and Vedic,** by different people."

Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī quotes the Skanda Purāṇa: "*sarva-nāmābhidheyaś ca sarva-vedeḍitaś ca saḥ*" — "He is addressed by all names and worshiped by all Vedas." However, that is where the potency of these non-*anādi* names stops. They can only be used to address the Lord but they cannot be expected to give the same result as eternal names. Sacred names of the Lord consist of His *rūpa-guṇa-līlā*, form, attributes and pastimes, and what do mundane cities like London or Paris have to do with that? Kṛṣṇa says in Bhagavad-gītā (8.6):

yaṁ yaṁ vāpi smaran bhāvan tyajantyante kalevaram
taṁ tam evaiti kaunteya sadā tad bhāva bhāvita

"Whatever one contemplates throughout life is what one attains when leaving the body."

So you may take your next birth in London or Paris by contemplating these names.

43b) Rādhā-Pārtha Sārathi is *rasābhāsa,* because, other than the brief visit to Kurukṣetra as is described in Śrīmad Bhāgavata, Rādhā does not consort with Kṛṣṇa as Pārtha Sārathi in Dwārakā.

46) SOME ASSOCIATES OF CAITANYA MAHĀPRABHU ARE NOT *NITYA SIDDHA* –

Caitanya Caritāmṛta Ādi 7.51, Bhaktivedanta purport:

"Therefore Tapana Miśra and Candraśekhara are understood to be kaniṣṭha-adhikārīs *because they could not refute the arguments of the sannyāsīs in Benares."*

Refutation - Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu's associates are called *nitya siddha* by Narottama in Prārthanā. *'gaurāṅgera saṅgī gane, nitya siddha kori māne'*. Kṛṣṇa also wondered whether to go into Aghāsura's mouth or not. Is He then a *kaniṣṭha adhikārī*?

And -

"The six goswamis are not all eternal associates of Krishna. Only Rupa and Raghunath Goswami are eternal associates. *You know there are two kinds of living entities: nityamukta or eternal associates of the Lord, and nityabaddha or eternally conditioned. This material manifestation is a chance for the eternally conditioned entities to go Back to Godhead; but when they go back there is no distinction between the two. When Krishna appears some of his eternal associates come with Him to assist Him in His different incarnational activities; and some of the living entities from conditioned life are liberated by following the footprint of Lord Krishna and His bonafide associates; so all the six became eternal associates of Krishna."*

Letter to Jadurani, September 9, 1967

Refutation – The *manjarī svarūpas* of the other Gosvāmīs are listed in Kavi-Karṇapura's 'Gaura-gaṇoddeśa dīpikā' verses 181, 184-186.

From the previous verse, 10.87.19, is clear that Paramātmā is the context here.

47) IS CAITANYA MAHĀPRABHU THE GURU OF TUKARĀM?

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami commentary on Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 9.282:

“It is said that Sri Caitanya Mahaprabhu initiated Tukarama when He visited Pandarapura, and thus Tukarama became His disciple.""

Also in his Introduction to Śrīmad Bhāgavatam:
“The Lord (Caitanya Mahāprabhu) extensively traveled all over the southern part of India. The great saint of Maharastra known as Saint Tukarama was also initiated by the Lord."

Refutation: This is impossible since Tukarām was born in 1608, while Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu already departed from this world in 1534.

48) SELLING DEITIES COMMERCIALLY AS DOLLS –
Prabhupāda: *No. In this way make a nice design Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. And Rādhārāṇī should be like this. [demonstrates Rādhārāṇī's right hand raised above waist-level, Her palm upwards and the thumb joined to the tip of Her index finger] This is Vṛndāvana style. Not this. This is Lakṣmī style. This. Make these arrangements.* ***I am hopeful of this business. Very good business we'll have.*** *I want to introduce in every family. They'll do it.* ***If they do not worship, let them keep as dolls.*** *That will also give them inspiration.*
Dhanañjaya: *Actually, so many Indians in the West, they're keeping just like dolls. They are not worshiping regularly. They're keeping on the mantlepiece or on the side.*
Prabhupāda: *In this way be encouraged, and in full capacity* ***do business*** *and get others.*
11 september 1976, Vṛndāvana, room conversation

Refutation - Caitanya Caritāmṛta Ādi 5.226-227:

sākṣāt vrajendra-suta ithe nāhi āna; yebā ajñe kore tāṅre pratimā-heno jñāna
sei aparādhe tāra nāhiko nistāra; ghora narakete paḍe, ki bolibo āra

"Without a doubt He is directly the son of the King of Vraja. Only a fool considers Him a doll. For that offense (of seeing a Lord as a doll), he cannot be liberated. Rather, he will fall into a terrible hellish condition. What more should I say?"

49) ARJUNA DEFEATED ŚIVA?

Bhagavad gītā as it is, 2.33, purport:

"Arjuna was a famous fighter, and he attained fame by fighting many great demigods, including even Lord Śiva. After fighting and defeating Lord Śiva in the dress of a hunter, Arjuna pleased the lord and received as a reward a weapon called pāśupata-astra."

Refutation – It is clearly described in all detail in Mahābhārata, Vana Parva, chapters 39 and 163, that Śiva defeated Arjuna instead of the other way around.

50) KARṆA BORN FROM KUNTI'S EAR?

Lecture on SB 1.8.24 -- Mayapura, October 4, 1974: *"Karṇa's history is that Karṇa is the pre-marriage son of Kuntī. Before her being married, he was born of Kuntī from the ear. Therefore his name is Karṇa."*

Lecture on SB 1.10.7 -- Mayapura, June 22, 1973: *"Generally, the son is born from the vagina, but Kuntī's son was born from the ear. Therefore Karṇa."*

Refutation – Karṇa being born from Kunti's ear is a part of the Indonesian version of Mahābhārata only. Karṇa was named so because he cut off his own cover or shield at the request of Indra, not because he was born from Kunti's ear.

51-52) THE HOLY *DHĀMA* MULTIPLYING *SĀDHANA* AND SIN 1,000x

Dhāma, dhāma-aparādha. In the dhāma... In other places if you chant Hare Kṛṣṇa, the result of such chanting will be increased thousand times if you chant in Vṛndāvana. Similarly, in other place, the sinful activities, if you commit that sinful activities in Vṛndāvana, then it will be thousand times increased. So we have to be very careful.

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami - Srīmad Bhāgavatam class in Vṛndāvana, September 10, 1976

Refutation – Where is the evidence in *śāstra* for –

1. The holy name being 1,000x more powerful in the *holy dhāma? śuddha-nāma* brings perfection, anywhere – can perfection be multiplied 1,000x?

Skānda Purāṇa states:

na deśa-kālāvasthātma-śuddhyādikam apekṣate
kintu svatantram evaitam nāma kāmita-kāma-dam

"The name of the Lord need not be chanted with regard to place, time, circumstantial conditions, preliminary self-purification or any other factors. Rather, it is completely independent of all other processes and rewards all the desires of those who eagerly chant it."

2. Where is the evidence for sinful reactions being multiplied 1,000x in the holy dhāma?
Śrīla Rūpa Goswāmī's Mathurā Māhātmya (23) states :

mathurāyāṁ kṛtaṁ pāpaṁ mathurāyāṁ vinaśyati

"Sins committed in Mathurā are destroyed in Mathurā."

53) TRANSCENDENTAL COMPETITION?
The Christmas distribution in England is unimaginable. Europe is a great field for preaching. New York-Radha Damodara and Los Angeles have already accepted defeat. This transcendental competition is very encouraging.
A.C Bhaktivedānta Swāmī letter to Jayatīrtha dās, January 13, 1977

Refutation -
Examples are given of the *gopas* competing with Kṛṣṇa or the *gopīs*' beauty and Kṛṣṇa's beauty, or Rādhā and Candrāvalī.

"Only difference is, that our profit is for Krishna's pleasure, and our competition is how to please Krishna more than someone else. Even amongst the Gopis there is competition to please Krishna, and there is envy also. But this envy is not material, it is transcendental."
Letter to Jayatīrtha dās -- Delhi 9 December, 1971.

This concept fails to take note of the difference between *sādhakas* and *siddhas*. Does Rūpa Gosvāmī list 'competition between *sādhakas*' as a limb of *bhakti*? Can there be any comparison between a *siddha*'s actions and a *sādhaka*'s actions? Did Rūpa and Sanātana Gosvāmī, who were playing the part of *sādhakas,* compete with each other or anyone else? Is there any example of competition between *sādhakas* in the history

of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism? Most *sādhakas* are simply not pure enough for that, it will result in *vaiṣṇavāparādha* for sure -
ahaṁ mamādi paramo nāmni so'py aparādha kṛt - Haribhakti Vilāsa (11.524)
kiṁ ca nāmny eva viṣaye yo'haṁ-mamādi-paramaḥ. ahaṁ bahutara-nāma-kīrtaka itas tato nāma-kīrtanaṁ ca mat-pravartitam eva mayā samo nāma-kīrtana-paro'nyaḥ kaḥ.
"To think 'I' and 'mine' to be the greatest in connection with the holy name is the 10th offence to the holy name" - *aham bahutara nāma kīrtaka* "I am the greater chanter of the holy name", *itas tato nāma-kīrtanaṁ ca mat-pravartitam eva mayā samo nāma-kīrtana-paro'nyaḥ kaḥ* - "Only I am spreading the chanting of the holy name all over the world, who is equal to me in dedication to *nāma kīrtan*?"

54) RĀJASŪYA SACRIFICE

On Śrīmad Bhāgavata 1.9.41 A.C Bhaktivedānta Swāmī comments:

"After gaining victory in the Battle of Kurukṣetra, Maharaja Yudhiṣṭhira, the Emperor of the world, performed the Rajasuya sacrificial ceremony."

The verse is spoken by Bhīṣma, who did not live after the war….how he could have witnessed it? The Mahābhārata clearly describes the sacrifice as taking place before the war, when Yudhiṣṭhira had gained Indraprastha.

55) CONSONANT GROUPS

Bhaktivedanta purport to Śrīmad-Bhāgavata 2.9.6 –
"In Sanskrit language, the consonants are divided into two divisions, namely the *sparśa-varṇas* and the *tālavya-varṇas*. From ka to ma the letters are known as the *sparśa-varṇas*, and the sixteenth of the group called is ta, whereas the twenty-first letter called is pa."

Correction - The distinction between the different groups of consonants is *sparśa-, antaḥsthaḥ-*, and *uṣman* sounds. The *tālavya-varṇas* are a part of the *sparśas*.

56) ARJUNA AND KUNTI NOT IN KṚṢṆA-LOKA

Question: Is it true that associates such as Arjuna and Queen Kunti are only eternal associates of Krishna in the material world not Krishna-Loka?

Answer by Bhaktivedanta, "To answer your second question, you should know that Arjuna and Kunti Devi are not in Krishna Loka. They are eternally associated with Krishna only in the material world." Letter to Saradia -- Los Angeles 12 December, 1968.

Refutation: Arjuna and Kunti are eternal associates which means that they are within both his manifest līlā as well as in the spiritual abode, Kṛṣṇa-loka. Otherwise it does not makes sense that they are called eternal associates. In Bhagavad Gītā (4.9) Kṛṣṇa says that anyone who understand his divine birth and activities comes to Him after giving up the present body. In verse 18.71 Kṛṣṇa also hints that Arjuna must attain the spiritual abode. Who is a better student of his than Arjuna, he is a mukta. After hearing the Gītā, Arjuna says that his illusion has been destroyed and he is situated beyond doubt. (18.73). In 18.62 Kṛṣṇa says that one who takes shelter of Him attains His eternal abode. From all these and similar statements in the Gīta, it can be concluded that even if Arjuna was not in Kṛṣṇa-loka, he should be there after his last life on earth.

57) HONORING PRASĀDĪ TĀMBŪLA –
Guest: (Sanskrit or Hindi: Krishna is offered tambula in the temple.)
Prabhupada: No, Krishna can take.
Guest: Yes. And that prasada of Bhagavan Shri Krishna...
Prabhupada: Yes.
Guest: ...the devotees can take also...
Prabhupada: No, prasadam, according to our principle... Just like on Ekadashi day, we do not accept even prasadam. Anna. We keep it. So prasadam... Just like on Ekadashi anna is prohibited, but not the Deity. Deity's offered anna, but we cannot take the prasadam even. So following strictly the principle, even tambula is offered to Krishna, it is not for us. Yes. Strictly following the principle. The same example... Just like on Ekadashi day, anna is offered to Krishna, but we don't take.
(ACBS. Room Conversation 11th July 1973. London.)

Refutation – *tāmbūla* is indeed forbidden on fasting days –

asakṛj jala pānācca Sakṛt tāmbūla bhakṣaṇāt
upavāsaḥ praduṣyeta diva svapācca maithunāt

Haribhakti vilāsa 13.50 – “Fasting is polluted by many times drinking water, eating betel even once, sleeping in the day or sex.”

However, on regular days one must accept betel *prasāda* –

bhakṣayed atha tāmbūlaṁ prasādam vallavī-prabhoḥ
śiṣṭair iṣṭair japed divyam bhagavan nāma mangalam

Haribhakti vilāsa 9. 389 – “One must (*bhakṣayet* is in the imperative case) then chew the betel nuts that were offered to the Lord of the *gopīs* and sit with devotees to chant the divine auspicious names of Bhagavān.”

sādhūnaṁ svagataṁ pūjā śeṣa naivedya bhojanam
tāmbūla śeṣa grahaṇaṁ vaiṣṇavaiḥ saha saṅgamaḥ

Haribhakti vilāsa 2.161 – “One must welcome and worship *sādhus*, eat leftover food and betel and associate with Vaiṣṇavas.”

Over-indulgence in *tāmbūla* can be injurious to health but a single *prasādi tāmbūla* should be honored, since refusal or rejection of *prasāda* is a form of disrespect.

CHANGING INTO, NOT OUT OF VAIṢṆAVA-DRESS
Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Madhya 14, 5 –

sārvabhauma-upadeśe chāḍi’ rāja-veśa; ekalā vaiṣṇava-veśe karila praveśa

SYNONYMS
sārvabhauma--of Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya; upadeśe--under instructions; chāḍi’--giving up; rāja-veśa--the royal dress; ekalā--alone; vaiṣṇava-veśe—in the dress of a Vaiṣṇava; karila praveśa--entered.

Bhaktivedanta Translation –
Following Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya’s instructions, the King had given up his royal dress. He now entered the garden in the dress of a Vaiṣṇava.

PURPORT

Sometimes members of the International Society for Krishna Consciousness--especially in the Western countries--find it difficult to approach people to distribute books because people are unfamiliar with the traditional saffron robes of the devotees. The devotees have therefore inquired whether they can wear European and American dress before the general public. From the instructions given to King Pratāparudra by Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya, we can understand that we may change our dress in any way to facilitate our service. When our members change their dress to meet the public or to introduce our books, they are not breaking the devotional principles. The real principle is to spread this Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement, and if one has to change into regular Western dress for this purpose, there should be no objection.

Refutation – This verse prescribes the opposite of what Swāmīji endorses in his purport – giving up mundane dress for Vaiṣṇava-dress.

MIS-ILLUSTRATIONS IN THE ISKCON-BOOKS

MI 1) THE FOUR KUMĀRAS are depicted with shaved heads and *śikhās*, while the Bhāgavata (3.8.5) states that they had matted locks instead – *svardhunyudād ardraiḥ sva **jaṭā-kalāpair** upaspṛśya*

MI 2) ŚRĪ CAITANYA MAHĀPRABHU, AS A *SANNYĀSĪ*, is depicted with a *brāhmaṇa*-thread, while Mahāprabhu took *sannyāsa* in the Śaṅkara *sampradāya*, whose *sannyāsīs* do not wear *śikhā* or *sūtra*.

MI 3) THE ASSOCIATES OF MAHĀPRABHU are often depicted wearing **saffron dress** and carrying ***tridaṇḍas***, while it is widely acknowledged that these practises were only introduced by Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvati in the 20th century.

MI 4) On the cover of ISCKON's original First Canto Bhāgavata Śrīman Mahāprabhu is depicted as dancing within the lotus planet of Goloka Vṛndāvana, whereas there is no evidence anywhere in scripture that He is situated there.

MI 5) MOTHER YAŚODĀ is depicted with a human complexion but Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī says in Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa Gaṇoddeśa Dīpikā (1.28) *mātā gopa-yaśo-dātrī yaśodā śyāmala-dyutiḥ* – "Kṛṣṇa's mother Yaśodā has a *śyāma*-complexion (like Kṛṣṇa's)."

MI 6) WHEN KṚṢṆA VISITED VARUṆALOKA (Kṛṣṇa-book chapter 28) He was not immersed in the water. Gopāla Campūḥ (20.2) says: *eṣa nivāsa-viśeṣaś ca tasya jala-stambha-vidyālambhitāra-bhavān svata eva bhāsvān bhāsvat-kanyā-hrada-stha-vivarasyādhaḥ-pradeśe sadeśa eva rasā-vivara-deśe niveśam āsīdati*

"Varuṇa has a certain mystic power (*vidyā*) with which he manages to block water (*jala-stambha*) out of his abode, which is a hole underground under the Yamunā."

Gopāla Campū 20.29 continues: *cacāla ca sa tābhyāṁ saha yāvad-vivarābhyāsam. āgamya ca tad-abhyāsaṁ tad-vartma-bhāga-sthita-nīraṁ vibhāgam āgamayya*

"Varuṇa accompanied Kṛṣṇa and Nanda Mahārāja till the gate of the cave in which he dwelled and there made a cleavage in the water so that they could easily return to the surface of the Yamunā."

Hence pictures that depict Kṛṣṇa visiting Varuṇa immersed under water are not correct.

MI 7) VARĀHA DEVA is depicted in the BBT 3rd Canto as reddish coloured but He was Śyāma-colored, as in Śrīmad Bhāgavata 3.13.33 -

> ***tamāla-nīlaṁ*** *sita-danta-koṭyā kṣmām utkṣipantaṁ gaja-līlayāṅga*
> *prajñāya baddhāñjalayo 'nuvākair viriñci-mukhyā upatasthur īśam*

Bhaktivedanta Translation –

Then the Lord, playing like an elephant, suspended the earth on the edge of His curved white tusks. He assumed a **bluish complexion like that of a Tamāla-tree**, and thus the sages, headed by Brahmā, could understand Him to be the Supreme Personality of Godhead and offered respectful obeisances unto the Lord."

Here too, the word 'assumed' is not in the verse. The Lord was always blue, He did not assume this complexion for this pastime

MI 8) Though **NĀRADA** is depicted in ISKCON books with straight black hair, Śrīmad Bhāgavat (10.70.32) says *vibhrad piṅga-jaṭā-bhāram*, he wears golden matted locks.

MI 9) In ISKCON-illustrations **KṚṢṆA'S *TILAK*** is invariably depicted as ISKCON-tilak, yellow with a leaf on the nose, while all *śāstras* say Kṛṣṇa has musk-tilak, and only on the forehead, not on the nose. *Kasturī-tilakaṁ lalāṭa paṭale*.

MI 10) On the picture where **MOTHER SĪTĀ VISITS MOTHER ŚACĪ** to see newly-born Nimāi mother Sītā looks like an elderly woman and mother Śacī as a teenage girl, while it is the other way around – Sītā was newly married, so a teenager, while Śacī had already delivered 9 children, so she was the elderly woman.

M 11) ADVAITA PRABHU DID NOT WORSHIP ŚĀLAGRAMA ŚILĀ TO INVOKE MAHĀPRABHU'S ADVENT.

Advaita Ācārya indeed had a Śālagrāma-śilā, as Advaita prakāśa, chapter 4, says –

dekhi eka śilā cakra sarva-sulakṣaṇa; bhakti kori tāhā loiyā korilā gamana

"He found a Cakra-Śīlā, endowed with all auspicious marks, which He took along with great devotion."

Caitanya Caritāmṛta (Ādi 3.105-109) describes Advaita Ācārya's invocation of Śrīman Mahaprabhu as follows –

gaṅgā-jala, tulasī-mañjarī anukṣaṇa; kṛṣṇa-pāda-padma bhāvi' kore samarpaṇa

"Thinking of the lotus feet of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, **He constantly offered Tulasī-mañjarīs and Gaṅgā-water**."

There is no mentioning here of Him worshiping a Śālagrāma-śilā for this purpose. Śrī Caitanya Bhāgavat (Ādi-khaṇḍa 2.78-83) also gives a summary description of the event, also without mentioning Advaita Ācārya worshipping a Śālagrama-śilā -

tulasī-mañjarī-sahita gaṅgā-jale; niravadhi seve kṛṣṇe mahā-kutūhale

In great eagerness **He always worshiped Kṛṣṇa with Tulasī-mañjarīs and Gaṅgā-water.** "

MIS-TRANSLATIONS OF *ŚĀSTRA*

MT 1) THE TRANSLATION OF THE FIRST VERSE OF 'THE NECTAR OF INSTRUCTION', or Upadeśāmṛta, is wrong - *'sarvām apimām pṛthivīṁ sasiṣyat'* means to control the whole world, not take disciples over the world.

vāco-vegam manasah krodha-vegam
jihvā-vegam udaropastha-vegam

etan vegan yo viṣaheta dhīraḥ
sarvam apimam pṛthivīm sa śiṣyāt

“A wise and sober person who can endure the impulses of speech, the mind, anger, the tongue, the belly and the genitals is verily most worthy to command the entire world.”

This is the rendering in Bengali verse, by Bhaktivinode -

vākya vega, mano vega, krodha vega āra; jivhā vega, udara vega, upastha vega chāra
ei chaya vega sahi kṛṣṇa nāmāśraya; ***jagat śāśite pāre*** *parajiya bhaye*

jagat śāśite pāre means ‘he can control the world’.

MT 2) THE WORD GOLOKA IN KṚṢṆA BOOK, chapter 27, is not Kṛṣṇaloka but Indra-loka, according to Jīva Goswāmī in Krama-sandarbha 10.27.1 *golokāt prākṛtād eva na tv aprākṛtāt indrasya tadīya saṅgo na sambhavatīti*

MT 3) PAURṆAMĀSĪ IS NOT RĀDHĀ'S MOTHER (Nectar of Devotion ch.47, p.381), but the grandmother of Nāndīmukhī and Madhumaṅgala (see Rādha-Kṛṣṇa Gaṇoddeśa Dīpikā (2.63-65)

MT 4) GREEKS AND TURKS? In Śrīmad Bhāgavata 2.4.18, *kirāta hūnāndhra pulinda pukkaśa* are not Greeks and Turks but hunter tribes in ancient India.

MT 5) HALAVA IN ANCIENT VRAJA?
Kṛṣṇa-book, ch. 24, p.170
"Prepare very nice foodstuffs of all descriptions from the grains and ghee collected for the yajna. Prepare rice, dahl, then halavah, pakora, puri and all kinds of milk preparations like sweet rice, sweetballs, sandesa, rasagulla and laddu and invite the learned brahmanas who can chant the Vedic hymns and offer oblations to the fire.”

Halava, pakora and puri are Turkish or other Muslim dishes that were not served in Vraja 5,000 years ago. The original text of Śrīmad Bhāgavata (10.24.26) says –

pacyantam vividhah pākaḥ sūpāntaḥ payasādayaḥ
samyava-pūpa-saskulyaḥ sarvadohaś ca gṛhyatam

"Let many different kinds of food be cooked, from sweet rice to vegetable soups! Many kinds of fancy cakes, both baked and fried, should be prepared. And all the available milk products should be taken for this sacrifice."

MT 6) SUBDUED BY HIS SWEETHEARTS OR VICE VERSA?
BBT Translation Caitanya Caritāmṛta Madhya 8.188 –

vidagdho nava-tāruṇyaḥ parihāsa-viśāradaḥ
niścinto dhīra-lalitaḥ syāt prāyah preyasī-vaśaḥ

SYNONYMS
vidagdhah--clever; nava-tarunyah--always freshly youthful; parihasa—in joking; visaradah--expert; niscintah--without anxiety; dhira-lalitah--a hero in loving affairs; syat--is; prayah--almost always; ***preyasī-vaśaḥ*****--one who keeps His girlfriends subjugated.**

Bhaktivedanta Translation –
"A person who is very cunning and always youthful, expert in joking and without anxiety, and who can keep his **girlfriends always subjugated**, is called *dhira-lalita*.'

Jīva Gosvāmī says, however, in his *ṭīkā* -
Preyasīnāṁ prema-viśeṣa-yuktānāṁ tāratamyena vaśībhūtaḥ - „He is controlled by His sweethearts according to their endowment of excellent *prema.* As He says in Śrīmad Bhāgavata (10.32.22) - *na pāraye 'ham niravadya-samyujaṁ sva-sādhu-kṛtyam vibudhāyuṣāpi vaḥ. yā mābhajan durjara-geha-śṛṅkhalaḥ saṁvṛścya tad vaḥ pratiyātu sādhunā* "I am not able to repay My debt for your spotless service, even within a lifetime of Brahmā. Your connection with Me is beyond reproach. You have worshiped Me, cutting off all domestic ties, which are difficult to break. Therefore please let your own glorious deeds be your compensation."

MT 7) 'INCARNATION' is not the right translation for the word *avatāra*. It is Latin for 'in the flesh' and is thus a *māyāvādī*-translation because, according to Vaiṣṇava *siddhānta*, God never goes in the flesh. The word *avatāra* is better translated

as 'descent'. Instead it is us conditioned souls who are incarnations - incarnations of the individual souls.

MT 8) 'DEMON' is often a way-too-heavy translation of the word *asura*, which means ungodly (*a* = un *sura* = godly). We must remember that *asuras*, the ungodly, are sinning out of ignorance (*ityajñāna vimohitaḥ*, Bhagavad-Gītā 16.15). Nor are all scientists and honest hardworking taxpayers 'demons' because, out of cultural conditioning they may eat meat or drink alcohol. In Caitanya Caritāmṛta (Ādi 8.8-12) it is indeed said that anyone who does not worship Kṛṣṇa and/or Mahāprabhu is a demon, but this attitude should not be imitated by those who are not on Śrīpād Kṛṣṇadās Kavirāja's level of pure *bhakti*. He has no envy or pride, unlike many immature devotees who imitate him by calling every non-devotee a demon.

MT 9) KARMI? *"I have read the clipping and you have also mentioned of the women wearing karmi clothes….." (SPL to Nalinikanta dasa, 21st November, 1975)*

"Dear Mr. Jacupko" -- that's his karmi name -- Conversation with Svarupa Damodara -- June 21, 1977, Vrndavana

Habitually all non-devotees are called *karmīs* in ISKCON, but actually nondevotees are called *avaiṣṇava, abhakta* or *bahirmukha* in Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava idiom. A *karmī* is following Vedic fruitive works-path instead.

MT 10) *JÑĀNA* is usually translated as 'mental speculation' and a *jñānī* is a mental speculator, but, although *jñāna mārga* is rejectable for pure *bhaktas*, this is not a just translation of the word, because the path of *jñāna* is a spiritual one, not a material one, as the word 'mental' implies. The mind is a material instrument and has nothing to do with *jñāna*.

MT 11) Translating the love between Kṛṣṇa and the *gopīs* as '**CONJUGAL**' is not correct, because conjugal means wedded love, whereas the love between Kṛṣṇa and the *gopīs* is extramarital love.

MT 12) The ***GUÑJĀ***-garland consists of small red/white/black beads, but, in his Nectar of Devotion, ch.41, p.330, A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swāmī calls them 'conchshells'.

Prabhupāda: Hare Kṛṣṇa. (break) ...garland, this girl. Garland just like beads.

Satsvarūpa: Make a garland out of stone?

Prabhupāda: Yes. Not stone.

Satsvarūpa: Shells.

Prabhupāda: They are conch shells, small conchshells. They are called gunja, gunja. They are called gunja? (break)

(A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami, 1st April 1974. Morning walk. Bombay.)

eta bali' tāṅre punaḥ prasāda karilā; 'govardhanera śilā', 'guñjā-mālā' tāṅre dilā

SYNONYMS

eta bali'—saying this; tāṅre—unto him; punaḥ—again; prasāda karilā—gave something in mercy; govardhanera śilā—a stone from Govardhana Hill; **guñjā-mālā—a garland of small conchshells;** tāṅre dilā—delivered to him.

Bhaktivedanta Translation –

After saying this, Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu again bestowed His mercy upon Raghunātha dāsa by giving him a stone from Govardhana Hill and **a garland of small conchshells.**

"śilā diyā gosāñi samarpilā 'govardhane'; guñjā-mālā diyā dilā 'rādhikā-caraṇe'"

SYNONYMS

śilā diyā—by offering this stone; gosāñi—Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu; samarpilā—offered; govardhane—a place near Govardhana Hill; **guñjā-mālā diyā—by offering the garland of small conchshells;** dilā—offered; rādhikā-caraṇe—shelter at the lotus feet of Śrīmatī Rādhārāṇī.

Bhaktivedanta Translation –

"By offering me the govardhana-śilā, Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu has offered me a place near Govardhana Hill, and by offering me **the garland of conchshells**, He has offered me shelter at the lotus feet of Śrīmatī Rādhārāṇī."(CC Antya 6:307)

guñjā-beads

MT 13) *ANĀDI,* which means 'beginningless' (*an* = not and *ādi* = beginning) is systematically translated as 'from time immemorial' which is incorrect, because time immemorial indicates a very long time, which may have had a beginning, whereas *anādi* really means without beginning. This feeds the misconception that the conditioning of the soul had a beginning at some point in time.

MT 14) *BHAKTI* is systematically translated as 'devotional service' which often creates awkwardness in the flow of the translated text. Perhaps Swamiji used this term to stress his preference for practical devotion, but actually *bhakti* means just 'devotional', meaning not just engagement but also attitude.

MT 15) BHAGAVAD GĪTĀ AS IT IS, 8.6:

Swāmījī omits or forgets the most important part of the verse in the English translation - *sadā tad bhāva bhāvita*, he attains that destination in his next life because he always meditates on it in this life. He does include it in the word-for-word translation, though, and mentions it in his purport. ("Of course the cumulative effect of the thoughts and actions of one's life influences one's thoughts at the moment of death; therefore the actions of this life determine one's future state of being.")
word-for-word: *sadā*--always; *tat*--that; *bhāva*--state of being; *bhāvita*--remembering.
TRANSLATION: "Whatever state of being one remembers when he quits his body, that state he will attain without fail."

MT 16) BHAGAVAD GĪTĀ AS IT IS, 9.26:

Swāmījī omits or forgets the very important word *prayatātmanā*, a pure person. The offering will only be accepted from a pure person. He mentions it in the word-for-word but not in the translation nor in the purport:
word-for-word: *aśnāmi*--accept; *prayata-ātmana*--of one in pure consciousness.
Bhaktivedanta Translation –
"If one offers Me with love and devotion a leaf, a flower, fruit or water, I will accept it."

Śrīdhara Swāmī comments that *prayatātma* means one should have a pure mind and Viśvanātha Cakravartī even insists on having a pure body as well.

MT 17) BHAGAVAD GĪTĀ AS IT IS, 1.40 and 3.24:

"When irreligion is prominent in the family, O Kṛṣṇa, the women of the family become corrupt, and from the degradation of womanhood, O descendant of Vṛṣṇi, comes **unwanted progeny**." (1.40)
"If I should cease to work, then all these worlds would be put to ruination. I would also be the cause of creating **unwanted population**, and I would thereby destroy the peace of all sentient beings."
The words used for 'unwanted progeny' are *varṇa saṅkara*, which actually mean 'mixed race' –

वर्ण	varNa	m.	species
सङ्कर	saGkara	m.	mixture
सङ्कर	saGkara	m.	blending together
सङ्कर	saGkara	m.	mixture of castes

MT 18) BHAGAVAD GĪTĀ AS IT IS, 15.6:

na tad bhāsayate sūryo na śaśāṅko na pavakaḥ
yad gatvā na nivartante tad dhāma paramam mama

SYNONYMS
na—not; tat—that; bhasayate—illuminates; suryah—sun; na—nor; sasankah—the moon; na—nor; **pavakah—fire,** electricity; yat—where; gatva—going; na—never; nivartante—comes back; tat dhama—that abode; paramam—supreme; mama—My.

Bhaktivedanta Translation –
"That abode of Mine is not illumined by the sun or moon, nor by **electricity**. One who reaches it never returns to this material world."

In the word-for-word *pavakaḥ* is correctly glossed as 'fire' but in the flowing translation it says 'electricity' whereas that did not exist 5,000 years ago.

MT 19) DEMIGODS

The word *deva* or *devatā* means 'god', or 'celestial'. Demigods are person from half-god, half-human descent, like the Pāṇḍavas. Hence the word 'god' with small *g* suffices. Kṛṣṇa is already distinguished by the title 'Supreme Personality of Godhead' anyway.

MT 20) PROJECTING ISKCON-MISSION ON MAHĀPABHU'S FLOOD OF PREMA

Caitanya-caritāmṛta Ādi-līlā 7.26–

saj-jana, durjana, paṅgu, jaḍa, andha-gaṇa
prema-vanyāya ḍubāila jagatera jana

SYNONYMS

sat-jana--gentlemen; durjana--rogues; paṅgu--lame; jaḍa--invalid; andhagaṇa--blind men; prema-vanyāya--in the inundation of love of Godhead; ḍubāila--drowned; jagatera--all over the world; jana--people.

Bhaktivedanta Translation –

The Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement will inundate the entire world and drown everyone, whether one be a gentleman, a rogue or even lame, invalid or blind.

Refutation - Neither the words **The Kṛṣṇa consciousness movement** is there in the verse, nor is the verse in future case. ***ḍubāilo*** is inundated, past case. That is clear when Swamiji returns to the context in the next verse –

jagat ḍubila, jīvera haila bīja nāśa
tāhā dekhi' pāñca janera parama ullāsa

SYNONYMS

jagat--the whole world; ḍubila--drowned; jīvera--of the living entities; haila--it so became; bīja --the seed; nāśa --completely finished; tāhā - then; dekhi'--by seeing; pāñca--five; janera--of the persons; parama--highest; ullāsa--happiness.

Bhaktivedanta Translation –

When the five members of the Pañca-tattva saw the entire world drowned in love of Godhead and the seed of material enjoyment in the living entities completely destroyed, they all became exceedingly happy.

MT 21) BHAGAVAD GĪTĀ AS IT IS, 5.14 – for *svabhāvas tu pravartate* Swamiji says: "All this is enacted by the modes of material nature." *svabhāva* does not mean 'the modes of material nature', it means 'inherent nature'. The *ṭīkākāras* gloss *svabhāva* here as *anādyavidyā*, beginningless ignorance.

MT 22) TUMBURU IN ŚRĪMAD BHĀGAVATA 1.13.38 and 59 –

Wrong translation of the word Tumburu. Instead of 'sage Tumburu' the BBT and Bhanu Swami translate it as Vīṇā. The Motilal and Gita press Bhāgavata do it properly, "the (divine) sage Narada, accompanied by Sage Tumburu." The Sanskrit dictionary also does not give a musical instrument as the meaning of *tumburu*. The *ācāryas' tīkās* say: Jīva Gosvāmī: *vīṇāṁ tritantrīṁ dhvanayan bhagavān saha-tumburuḥ*; Vamśīdhara – *tumburur gandharva viśeṣaḥ;* Vīra-rāghava: *tumburuṇā saha vartamānaḥ;* Vallabhācārya – *tumburur anya ṛṣiḥ*

MT 23) VṚṢALĪ

वृषली	vRSalI	f.	zUdra woman
वृषली	vRSalI	f.	woman of low caste

Spokensanskrit.de

vṛṣalī does not mean prostitute – it means a *śūdra*-woman, marrying whom is a great sin for a *brāhmaṇa*. Perhaps this was mistranslated to gloss over all mixed marriages in ISKCON?

aho me paramaṁ kaṣṭam abhūd avijitātmanaḥ;
yena viplāvitaṁ brahma vṛṣalyāṁ jāyatātmanā

(BBT Śrīmad-bhāgavat 6.2.26)

SYNONYMS

aho—alas; me—my; paramam—extreme; kaṣṭam—miserable condition; abhūt—became; avijita-ātmanaḥ—because my senses were uncontrolled; yena—by which; viplāvitam—destroyed; brahma—all my brahminical qualifications; ***vṛṣalyām—through a śūdrāṇī, a maidservant;*** *jāyatā—being born; ātmanā—by me.*

Bhaktivedanta Translation –

Ajāmila said: Alas, being a servant of my senses, how degraded I became! I fell down from my position as a duly qualified brāhmaṇa and begot children in the womb of a **prostitute**.

anyathā mriyamāṇasya nāśucer vṛṣalī-pateḥ
vaikuṇṭha-nāma-grahaṇaṁ jihvā vaktum ihārhati (BBT Śrīmad-bhāgavat 6.2.33)

SYNONYMS

anyathā—otherwise; mriyamāṇasya—of a person who is just ready for death; na—not; aśuceḥ—most unclean; ***vṛṣalī-pateḥ—the keeper of a prostitute****; vaikuṇṭha—of the Lord of Vaikuṇṭha; nāma-grahaṇam—the chanting of the holy name; jihvā—the tongue; vaktum—to speak; iha—in this situation; arhati—is able.*

Bhaktivedanta Translation –
Were it not for my past devotional service, how could I, a most unclean keeper of a **prostitute,** have gotten an opportunity to chant the holy name of Vaikuṇṭhapati when I was just ready to die? Certainly it could not have been possible.

MT 24) BHAUMA IJYA-DHI

Swāmiji consistently translates the words *'bhauma ijya dhi'* in Śrīmad Bhāgavata's famous *'yasyātma buddhiḥ'* (10.84.13)-*śloka* as 'land of birth', while the *ācāryas* translate *bhauma* as 'earthen images' –

Morning Walk -- October 19, 1975, Johannesburg:

Prabhupāda: He is animal. That's all. Sa eva gokharaḥ. That is the verdict of the śāstra. Yasyātmā buddhiḥ kuṇape tri-dhātuke: (SB 10.84.13) "Anyone who considers this body made of three elements—kapha, pitta, vayu—as self," yasyātma-buddhi kuṇape tri-dhātuke svadhiḥ kalatradiṣu, "and the accidental combination of family members, they are own kinsmen," sva-dhiḥ kala..., bhauma idyadhiḥ, "and the land in which they are born, that is worshipable..." That is nationalism, so-called nationalism.

Refutation - Śrīla Jīva Goswāmī writes in Bhakti Sandarbha 245 -
bhauma ijya-dhīr iti sādhāraṇa-devatā-viṣayakam eva pūrvaṁ tathaivopakrāntatvāt - arcāyām eva haraye [bhā.pu. 11.2.45] ity-ādi-virodhāc ca

"The limitation of the divine to earthen images refers to the worship of ordinary gods, as understood from the verses preceding this one in the same chapter, in which the identical topic is begun. It cannot refer to the worship of the deity forms of Lord Viṣṇu because this would contradict the principle stated in this verse: *arcāyām eva haraye pūjāṁ yah śraddhayehate na tad-bhaktesu cānyesu sa bhaktah prākṛtaḥ smṛtaḥ* "One who faithfully worships Lord Hari only in the form of the deity, but does not render service to the Lord's devotees or to other living beings is a neophyte devotee" (Śrīmad Bhāgavata 11.2.47)

Viśvanātha Cakravartī's *ṭīkā* of Śrīmad Bhāgavata 10.84.13 - *atra bhaume bhagavat pratimā bhinne vyākhyeyam - arcāyām eva haraye pūjāṁ yah śraddhayehate na*

tad-bhakteṣu cānyeṣu sa bhaktah prākṛtah smṛtaḥ. 'The word *bhauma* is explained to mean earthen images of other gods than the Supreme Lord, as mentioned in (Śrīmad Bhāgavata 11.2.47) *arcāyām eva haraye pūjāṁ yaḥ śraddhayehate na tad-bhakteṣu cānyeṣu sa bhaktaḥ prākṛtaḥ smṛtaḥ* "One who faithfully worships Lord Hari only in the form of the deity, but does not render service to the Lord's devotees or to other living beings is a neophyte devotee" Sanātana Goswāmī and Śrīdhara Swāmi comment in the same way on Śrīmad Bhāgavata 10.84.13.

MT 25) SWĀMĪJĪ WRITES 'HARE KṚṢṆA MANTRA' WHEREVER THERE IS JUST 'NĀMA SANKĪRTAN' WRITTEN

dui gosāi 'hari' bole ānandita mana [Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Ādi 12.21]

Bhaktivedanta Translation –
"While Lord Caitanya Mahaprabhu and Advaita Prabhu chanted the Hare Kṛṣṇa mantra and danced, there were various ecstatic symptoms in Their bodies, and Their minds were very pleased."

The text just says 'The two Lords blissfully said 'Hari' [not *hare kṛṣṇa mantra*]

cāri bhakta sange kṛṣṇa-kīrtan kutūhole [Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Madhya 4.10]

Bhaktivedanta Translation –
Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu proceeded toward Jagannātha Puri with four of His devotees, and He chanted the holy name of the Lord, the Hare Kṛṣṇa mantra, with great eagerness.

It actually says 'With four devotees they eagerly did Kṛṣṇa kīrtan [not *hare kṛṣṇa mantra*]

gambhīrāra dvāre govinda karilā śayana
saba-rātri prabhu karena ucca-sankīrtana [Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Antya 17.9]

Bhaktivedanta Translation –
"Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu's personal servant, Govinda, lay down at the door of His room, and the Lord very loudly chanted the Hare Kṛṣṇa mahā-mantra all night."

However, the text says '*ucca sankīrtan*', not 'the Hare Kṛṣṇa mahā-mantra'.

MT 26 CAITANYA CARITĀMṚTA ĀDI LĪLĀ CHAPTER 17-

jiyāite pāre yadi, tabe māre prāṇī; veda-purāṇe āche hena ājñā-vāṇī

Bhaktivedanta translation –

"In the Vedas and Purāṇas there are injunctions declaring that if one can revive a living being, one can kill it for experimental purposes." (CC Adi 17.160)

Correction - There is no mention of a test in the verse.

MT 27-31) CAITANYA CARITĀMṚTA ANTYA LĪLĀ CHAPTER 6 –

MT 27) Antya 6.295

ei śilāra kara tumi sāttvika pūjana; acirāt pābe tumi kṛṣṇa-prema-dhana

Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu continued, “Worship this stone in the mode of goodness like a perfect *brāhmaṇa*, for by such worship you will surely attain ecstatic love of Kṛṣṇa without delay.

Correction - ‘Like a perfect *brāhmaṇa*’ is not mentioned in the verse. Raghunātha Dās Goswāmī was a *kāyastha*. This is an interpolated *daivi-varṇāśrama* idea of ISKCON/Gauḍīya Maṭh.

MT 28) Antya 6.297 *dui-dike dui-patra madhye komala mañjarī* –

“…each with two Tulasī-leaves, one on each side of each flower."

Correction - This should be ‘on two sides are two leaves and in the middle a delicate *tulasī manjarī*’

MT 29) Antya 6.300

ei-mata raghunātha karena pūjana; pūjā-kāle dekhe śilāya ’vrajendra-nandana’

SYNONYMS

ei-mata--in this way; raghunātha--Raghunātha dāsa Gosvāmī; karena pūjana-- worships; pūjā-kāle--while worshiping; dekhe--he sees; śilāya--in the stone from Govardhana; vrajendra-nandana--the son of Nanda Mahārāja.

Bhaktivedanta Translation –

"Thus Raghunātha dāsa began worshiping the stone from Govardhana, and as he worshiped he saw the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Kṛṣṇa, the son of Nanda Mahārāja, directly in the stone."

Correction - 'He saw the Supreme Personality of Godhead' is *rasābhāsa,* as it is a reverent title of Kṛṣṇa. The whole story is meant to describe *rāgānugā pūjā*, not *vaidhi pūjā.*

MT 30) Antya 6.304

aṣṭa-kauḍira khājā-sandeśa kara samarpaṇa; śraddhā kari' dile, sei amṛtera sama

SYNONYMS

aṣṭa-kauḍira--costing eight kauḍis; khājā-sandeśa--khājā and sandeśa sweetmeats; kara samarpaṇa--offer; śraddhā kari'--with love and faith; dile-- if you offer; sei--that; amṛtera sama--just like nectar.

Bhaktivedanta Translation –

"Offer the Govardhana stone eight *kauḍis* worth of the first-class sweetmeats known as *khājā* and *sandeśa*. If you offer them with faith and love, they will be just like nectar."

Correction - 'first class' is not there

MT 31) Antya 6.304 *aṣṭa kauḍira* comes again in this verse but Swāmiji forgot to mention it.

ISKCON ODDITIES

Customs unique about ISKCON, though not clearly prohibited by *śāstra*, are -

O 1) Eating of carrots, even or especially on Ekādaśī.

O 2) *kīrtan* of the name of the Guru, and in each and every *kīrtana* too. The chanting of ISKCON's Guru's name in each *kīrtan* makes the *kīrtan* sectarian and excludes non-ISKCON members from participation or at least makes them feel uncomfortable.

O 3) Calling all men, even totally degraded ones, '*prabhu*', a title reserved in *śāstra* for *ācāryas* and *avatāras* only.

O 4) Calling every female devotee '*mātājī*', even young girls, though the title is only used in India for senior Guru-type women.

O 5) Chanting loud *japa*.

O 6) Allowing guests, who usually have no *dīkṣā* or know any type of *sadācāra*, to **perform *abhiṣekha*** during religious festivals. This is not mercy, but *sevāparādha - ucchiṣṭe vāthavāśauce bhagavad-darśanādikam.* "Seeing (let alone showering) the Lord in an unclean state." Mercy comes in the form of *mahāprasāda* and *harināma*.

O 7) 108-CHANTING BEADS REPRESENT 108 GOPĪS "*Kṛṣṇa had many thousands of cows, and they were divided into groups according to their colors. They were also differently named according to color. When He would prepare to return from the pasturing ground, He would gather all the cows. As Vaiṣṇavas count 108 beads,* ***which represent the 108 individual gopīs****, so Kṛṣṇa would also count on 108 beads to count the different groups of cows."*

KṚṢṆA-book, ch. 35: The Gopis' Feelings of Separation"

Refutation: This is very sweet, but it is unfortunately also not confirmed in any *śāstra*.

O 8) GOPĪNĀTHA STANDS FOR *PRAYOJANA,* GOVINDAJĪ FOR *ABHIDHEYA* AND MADANA MOHANA FOR *SAMBANDHA*

This is an idea of Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī only and has no older origin. There is no difference between the three. Where would that leave Rādhāramaṇa, Gokulānanda etc? Are not all deities of Kṛṣṇa *prayojana*?

O 9) GOLDEN AGE OF 10,000 YEARS?

Prabhupada: Oh, yes. Improve. Not for the time being. For ten thousand years.
Giriraja: Yes. Out of 427,000 years I was taking that 10,000 as for the time being.
Tamala Kṛṣṇa: Srila Prabhupada, where is the mention of that ten thousand years?
Prabhupada: That I have heard it. Maybe in the Bhagavata. Such a nice thing. Alone in this world I am struggling, and the so-called intelligent persons, they will not come.
Room Conversation -- April 5, 1977, Bombay

Refutation: This is neither mentioned in Śrīmad Bhāgavat nor in any of the Goswāmīs' books.

CONCLUDING:

ISKCON and Gauḍīya Maṭha may or may not have a *dīkṣā-paramparā,* but they certainly don't have a *śikṣā-paramparā.* They stress a *bhāgavata paramparā,* but all the different points in the above essay show they do not even have such a *śikṣā paramparā* either.

Some then say that A.C. Bhaktivedānta Swami may have made mistakes but that is allright on the basis of this Śrīmad Bhāgavat-verse (1.5.11):

tad-vāg-visargo janatāgha-viplavo yasmin prati-ślokam abaddhavaty api
nāmāny anantasya yaśo 'ṅkitāni yat śṛṇvanti gāyanti gṛṇanti sādhavaḥ

tat—that; vāk—vocabulary; visargaḥ—creation; janatā—the people in general; agha—sins; viplavaḥ—revolutionary; yasmin—in which; prati-ślokam—each and every stanza; ***abaddhavati—irregularly composed; api—in spite of****; nāmāni—transcendental names, etc.; anantasya—of the unlimited Lord; yaśaḥ—glories; aṅkitāni—depicted; yat—what; śṛṇvanti—do hear; gāyanti—do sing; gṛṇanti—do accept; sādhavaḥ—the purified men who are honest.*

"On the other hand, that literature which is full of descriptions of the transcendental glories of the name, fame, forms, pastimes, etc., of the unlimited Supreme Lord is a different creation, full of transcendental words directed toward bringing about a revolution in the impious lives of this world's misdirected civilization. Such transcendental literatures, ***even though imperfectly composed****, are heard, sung and accepted by purified men who are thoroughly honest."*

Note, however, that the crucial words *abaddhavatyapi* refer to mistakes in vocabulary, grammar or style and not to misrepresentation of the Vedic and the six Gosvāmīs' teachings. Śrīdhara Swāmī comments here: *apa-śabdādi yukta* – "endowed with the wrong wording". Jīva Gosvāmī: *yat kincit pratīta sāṅketāditvād asamyag artha bodhaka* – "Words insinuating another or incomplete meaning."

THE SENĀPATI –

Then there is the argument that Swāmījī is empowered because he spread Kṛṣṇa consciousness all over the world, and therefore he can change the scriptures and the basic teachings of the *sampradāya*. First of all, no amount of quantitative success gives anyone the right to change even one syllable of the Gosvāmīs' teachings, and secondly, did he single-handedly spread his movement all over the world? His disciples opened all the temples, while he only opened the first temple, in New York,

in 1966. Do his disciples then also have the right to change the Vedic and Gosvāmīs' *siddhāntas*, on the basis of their hard labor? One wouldn't think so.

Swami's followers often quote verses out of context and project them upon him, such as this verse from Locan Dās' Caitanya Mangal:

yadi pāpī chāḍi dharma dūre deśe yāya
mora senapati-bhakta yāibe tathāya

"If some sinful people escape and giving up religious principles go to far off countries, then my Senapati Bhakta will come at that time to give them Kṛṣṇa consciousness. (*senapati* - a military field commander, *bhakta* - a devotee. Lord Caitanya will empower His own devotee to spread Kṛṣṇa Consciousness around the world.)"

However, this verse has nothing to do with preaching in the west. At the time this verse was written (16th century Bengal) there was no knowledge of countries outside India so *dūra deśa* simply meant Assam or Gujarat or so, not America because the USA did not even exist in those days. Secondly, western devotees did not flee from Bengal to far-off places because they were born in the west and had never even been to Bengal.

Some say: "Well, all that scriptural evidence is very nice, but Prabhupāda is beyond that. He is empowered by Kṛṣṇa Himself, you can see that in these 208 temples in 184 countries, 25.000 followers, etc. etc."

However, **QUANTITY DOES NOT PROVE QUALITY**. Rajneesh has millions of followers, many more than Prabhupāda, but does that make him an 'empowered' pure devotee? And ISKCON itself says that 'More people come to the vegetable market than to the jeweller's", confirming that quantity does not prove quality. If quantity is all that matters, then convert to Christianity, that must be the best, they have 2 billion followers.

Bhagavad Gītā (16.23) says:

yaḥ śāstra-vidhiṁ utsṛjya vartate kāma kārataḥ
na sa siddhim avāpnoti na sukhaṁ na paraṁ gatiṁ

"He who rejects scriptural injunctions and acts according to his own whims, will not attain perfection, nor will he become happy or attain the Supreme Abode." Moreover, Śrīla Narottama Ṭhākura Mahāśaya says (in Prema Bhakti Candrikā): *sādhu śāstra guru vākya, hṛdaye koriyā aikya* — The words of the *guru* must be compatible with the words of *sādhu* and *śāstra,* just as the words of *sādhu* must be compatible with *guru* and *śāstra* and the words of *śāstra* must be confirmed by *sādhu* and *guru.* There is no evidence in any scripture that a Guru can change the basic tenets of a *sampradāya* merely on the strength of his large number of temples and followers.

All this is not being '**UNGRATEFUL TO PRABHUPĀDA**'. Everybody is entitled to the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. My father has worked hard for my food, shelter, clothing and education, but later I decided that it is wrong to eat beef and drink liquor, as he was doing. So I no longer follow him in that, yet I am grateful to my father. If a Christian reverend, Jewish Rabbi or Muslim Imam would blame an ISKCON devotee for being ungrateful to Jesus or Muhammad by leaving Christianity or Islam to join Hare Kṛṣṇa, the ISKCON devotee will say ISKCON gave them something greater. Is that not ungrateful too? No, because they **did** get something greater in ISKCON. Similarly we are not ungrateful because we got something greater than what we got from ISKCON. We could, in return, accuse Bhaktisiddhānta Saraswatī and A.C. Bhaktivedānta Swāmī of ungratefulness for rejecting the caste-Goswāmīs and *bābājīs* from whom they originally learned *bhakti*.

We owe the introduction to the basics of Kṛṣṇa consciousness to A.C. Bhaktivedānta Swami, but that does not mean that we should forever continue to follow him in things that we feel are deeply flawed, such as the issues listed above.

CONCLUDING -

ISKCON and Gauḍīya Maṭha may or may not have *dīkṣā*, but surely they have no

1. (proper) *Siddhānta*
2. *Prayojana*
3. *Upāsanā*
4. *Maryādā*